arXiv:1407.5398v1 [math.FA] 21 Jul 2014

ON SPECTRAL AND PSEUDOSPECTRAL FUNCTIONS OF FIRST-ORDER SYMMETRIC SYSTEMS

VADIM MOGILEVSKII

Abstract. We consider general (not necessarily Hamiltonian) first-order symmetric system $Jy' - B(t)y = \Delta(t)f(t)$ on an interval $\mathcal{I} = [a, b)$ with the regular endpoint a. A distribution matrix-valued function $\Sigma(s)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, is called a spectral (pseudospectral) function of such a system if the corresponding Fourier transform is an isometry (resp. partial isometry) from $L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ into $L^2(\Sigma)$. The main result is a parametrization of all spectral and pseudospectral functions of a given system by means of a Nevanlinna boundary parameter τ. Similar parameterizations for various classes of boundary problems have earlier been obtained by Kac and Krein, Fulton, Langer and Textorius, Sakhnovich and others.

1. Introduction

Let H and $\widehat{H}$ be finite dimensional Hilbert spaces and let

$$\mathbb{H} := H \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus H. \tag{1.1}$$

Denote also by $[\mathbb{H}]$ the set of all linear operators in $\mathbb{H}$. We study first-order symmetric systems of differential equations defined on an interval $\mathcal{I} = [a, b), -\infty < a < b \le \infty$, with the regular endpoint a and regular or singular endpoint b. Such a system is of the form [2, 11]

$$Jy' - B(t)y = \Delta(t)f(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $B(t) = B^*(t)$ and $\Delta(t) \ge 0$ are locally integrable $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued functions on $\mathcal{I}$ and

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -I_H \\ 0 & iI_{\widehat{H}} & 0 \\ I_H & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : H \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus H \to H \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus H. \tag{1.3}$$

Recall that system (1.2) is called definite if each solution of the homogeneous system

$$Jy' - B(t)y = \lambda\Delta(t)y, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \tag{1.4}$$

satisfying $\Delta(t)y(t) = 0$ (a.e. on $\mathcal{I}$) is trivial, i.e., $y(t) = 0$, $t \in \mathcal{I}$. Recall also that system (1.2) is called a Hamiltonian system if $\widehat{H} = \{0\}$ and hence

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_H \\ I_H & 0 \end{pmatrix} : H \oplus H \to H \oplus H. \tag{1.5}$$

Let $\mathfrak{H} := L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ be the Hilbert space of functions $f(\cdot) : \mathcal{I} \to \mathbb{H}$ satisfying $\int_{\mathcal{I}} (\Delta(t)f(t), f(t))_{\mathbb{H}}\, dt < \infty$ and let $\mathfrak{H}_b$ be the set of functions $f \in \mathfrak{H}$ with compact support. Denote also by $Y_0(\cdot, \lambda)$ the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 34B08,34B40,34L10,47A06,47B25.

Key words and phrases. First-order symmetric system, spectral function, pseudospectral function, Fourier transform, characteristic matrix.

$[\mathbb{H}]$-valued operator solution of (1.4) satisfying $Y_0(a,\lambda)=I_{\mathbb{H}}$. For each function $f(\cdot)\in\mathfrak{H}_b$ define the Fourier transform

$$\widehat{f}(s)=\int_{\mathcal{I}}Y_0^*(t,s)\Delta(t)f(t)\,dt. \tag{1.6}$$

Definition 1.1. A distribution $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued function $\Sigma(s),\ s\in\mathbb{R}$, is called a spectral function of the system (1.2) if for each $f\in\mathfrak{H}_b$ the following Parseval equality holds

$$\int_{\mathcal{I}}(\Delta(t)f(t),f(t))\,dt=\int_{\mathbb{R}}(d\Sigma(s)\widehat{f}(s),\widehat{f}(s)). \tag{1.7}$$

This means that the mapping $Vf=\widehat{f},\ f\in\mathfrak{H}_b$, admits an extension to an isometry $V=V_\Sigma$ from $\mathfrak{H}$ to $L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ (for definition of the Hilbert space $L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ see [9, 16] and also Section 2.3).

As is known the extension theory of symmetric linear relations gives a natural framework for studying of spectral functions of symmetric systems.Assume that system (1.2) is definite. Then according to [18, 23, 32] this system generates the minimal linear relation $T_{\min}$ and the maximal linear relation $T_{\max}$ in $\mathfrak{H}$. It turns out that $T_{\min}$ is a closed symmetric relation with possibly nontrivial multivalued part $\operatorname{mul}T_{\min}=\{f\in\mathfrak{H}:\{0,f\}\in T_{\min}\}$. Moreover, the deficiency indices $n_\pm(T_{\min})$ of $T_{\min}$ are not necessarily equal and satisfy $n_\pm(T_{\min})\le\dim\mathbb{H}$.

Recall that a linear relation $\widetilde{T}=\widetilde{T}^*\supset T_{\min}$ in a Hilbert space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}\supset\mathfrak{H}$ is called an exit space self-adjoint extension of $T_{\min}$. Denote by $\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})$ the set of all (minimal) exit space self-adjoint extensions of $T_{\min}$ and let $\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ be the set of all $\widetilde{T}\in\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})$ with $\operatorname{mul}\widetilde{T}=\operatorname{mul}T_{\min}$. Each extension $\widetilde{T}\in\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})$ generates a generalized resolvent $R(\lambda)$ of $T_{\min}$ defined by

$$R(\lambda)=P_{\mathfrak{H}}(\widetilde{T}-\lambda)^{-1}\restriction\mathfrak{H},\quad\lambda\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}. \tag{1.8}$$

According to [3, 7, 35] $R(\lambda)$ admits the representation

$$(R(\lambda)f)(x)=\int_{\mathcal{I}}Y_0(x,\lambda)(\Omega(\lambda)+\tfrac{1}{2}\operatorname{sgn}(t-x)J)Y_0^*(t,\overline{\lambda})\Delta(t)f(t)\,dt,\quad f\in\mathfrak{H}, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\Omega(\cdot)=\Omega_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot):\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}\to[\mathbb{H}]$ is an operator function called a characteristic matrix of the system (1.2). Since $\Omega(\cdot)$ is a Nevanlinna function, the equality (the Stieltjes formula)

$$\Sigma(s)=\Sigma_\Omega(s)=\lim_{\delta\to+0}\lim_{\varepsilon\to+0}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-\delta}^{s-\delta}\operatorname{Im}\Omega(\sigma+i\varepsilon)\,d\sigma \tag{1.10}$$

defines a distribution $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued function $\Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$ (the spectral function of $\Omega(\cdot)$).

Let $X_\Delta=\{t\in\mathcal{I}:\Delta(t)\ \text{ is invertible}\}$ and let μ_1 be the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{I}$. If $\mu_1(\mathcal{I}\setminus X_\Delta)=0$, then $T_{\min}$ is a densely defined operator in $\mathfrak{H}$ and hence each extension $\widetilde{T}\in\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})$ is an operator (this implies that $\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})=\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$). By using the same methods as in [35] one can show that in this case for each $\widetilde{T}\in\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})$ the equalities (1.8)–(1.10) define a spectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ of the system (1.2).

If $\mu_1(\mathcal{I}\setminus X_\Delta)>0$, then the situation is more complicated. In particular, in this case spectral functions of the system (1.2) may not exist.

Spectral type functions of Hamiltonian systems (1.2) with $\mu_1(\mathcal{I}\setminus X_\Delta)\ge0$ were studied in [17, 18, 33, 34]. Namely, let $\varphi(t,\lambda)=(\varphi_1(t,\lambda),\,\varphi_2(t,\lambda))^\top(\in[H,H\oplus H])$ be an operator solution of (1.4) with $\varphi_1(a,\lambda)=I_H$ and $\varphi_2(a,\lambda)=0$ and let

$$\widehat{f}_\varphi(s)=\int_{\mathcal{I}}\varphi^*(t,s)\Delta(t)f(t)\,dt,\quad s\in\mathbb{R} \tag{1.11}$$

be the "truncated" Fourier transform of a function $f \in \mathfrak{H}_b$ (cf. (1.6)). Moreover, let T be a symmetric extension of $T_{\min}$ defined as a closure of the set of all $\{y, f\} \in T_{\max}$ such that a function $y = \{y_1(t), y_2(t)\} (\in H \oplus H)$ has compact support and satisfies $y_2(a) = 0$. Assume also that $\operatorname{mul} T = \{f \in \mathfrak{H} : \{0, f\} \in T\}$ is a multivalued part of T and let $\mathfrak{H}_0 := \mathfrak{H} \ominus \operatorname{mul} T$, so that

$$\mathfrak{H} = \operatorname{mul} T \oplus \mathfrak{H}_0. \tag{1.12}$$

In the papers by Kats [17, 18] Hamiltonian systems (1.2) with $H = \mathbb{C}$ and $B(t) \equiv 0$ were considered. In these papers a quasispectral function is defined as a scalar distribution function $\sigma_\varphi(s),\ s \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfying

$$\int_{\mathcal{I}} (\Delta(t) f(t), f(t))\, dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{f}_\varphi(s)|^2\, d\sigma_\varphi(s) \tag{1.13}$$

for all $f \in \mathfrak{H}_b \cap \mathfrak{H}_0$. Moreover, $\sigma_\varphi(s)$ is called a spectral function if (1.13) holds for all $f \in \mathfrak{H}_b$. It is shown in [18] that at least one quasispectral function always exists, while a spectral function exists if and only if $\operatorname{mul} T = \{0\}$. Observe also that the subspace $\mathfrak{H}_0$ is characterized in [18] in terms of indivisible intervals for $\Delta(t)$.

Recall that system (1.2) is called regular if $b < \infty$ and the coefficients $\Delta(t)$ and $B(t)$ are integrable on $\mathcal{I} = [a, b]$. Spectral and pseudospectral functions of regular Hamiltonian systems with $B(t) \equiv 0$ were studied in [33] (see also [34]). Clearly, for such a system the Fourier transform (1.11) is well defined for every function $f \in \mathfrak{H}$; moreover, [33, Lemma 6] yields $\operatorname{mul} T = \{f \in \mathfrak{H} : \widehat{f}_\varphi(s) \equiv 0,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\}$. According to [33] a distribution $[H]$-valued function $\Sigma_\varphi(\cdot)$ is called a pseudospectral function if

$$\int_{\mathcal{I}} (\Delta(t) f(t), f(t))\, dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (d\Sigma_\varphi(s) \widehat{f}_\varphi(s), \widehat{f}_\varphi(s)), \quad f \in \mathfrak{H}_0.$$

Under certain additional assumptions, a description of all pseudospectral (and spectral) functions $\Sigma_\varphi(\cdot)$ of a regular Hamiltonian system (1.2) is obtained in [33, 34]. Such a description is given in terms of a linear-fractional transform of a Nevanlinna operator pair which plays a role of a parameter.

Spectral functions of a general (not necessarily Hamiltonian) definite system (1.2) defined on $\mathcal{I} = [a, b),\ b \le \infty$, were studied in [20, 21, 22]. According to [21] an $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued distribution function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ is called a spectral function of system (1.2) if the mapping $Vf = \widehat{f}$ defined by (1.6) admits an extension to a contraction V from $\mathfrak{H}$ to $L^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H})$ satisfying $||Vf|| = ||f||$ for all $f \in \operatorname{dom} T_{\max}$. By using the Krein's method of directing mappings the authors establish in [21] a correspondence between spectral functions and self-adjoint extensions of $T_{\min}$.

In the present paper we study spectral and pseudospectral functions of definite symmetric systems (1.2). We specify a connection between boundary problems for such systems and pseudospectral functions $\Sigma(\cdot)$. This enables us to parameterize all functions $\Sigma(\cdot)$ in terms of a boundary parameter.

Note that some of our results are closely related to those from [21, 22] (for more details see Remarks 4.6, 4.14 and 4.20 below).

Assume that $\Sigma(\cdot)$ is an $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued distribution function on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following condition:

(C) The mapping $Vf = \widehat{f}$ originally defined by (1.6) on $\mathfrak{H}_b$ admits an extension to a partial isometry $V = V_\Sigma$ from $\mathfrak{H}$ to $L^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H})$.

We prove that in this case

$$\operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \subset \ker V_\Sigma. \tag{1.14}$$

For an $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued distribution function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ satisfying the condition (C) and the additional condition $||V_\Sigma f|| = ||f||,\ f \in \operatorname{dom} T_{\min}$, the inclusion (1.14) can be derived from the results of [21] (see Remark 4.6 below).

Let system (1.2) be Hamiltonian with $\dim H = 1$ and $B(t) \equiv 0$, let $\widehat{f}_\varphi(s)$ be the Fourier transform (1.11) and let $\sigma(s)$ be a scalar distribution function such that the mapping $Vf = \widehat{f},\ f \in \mathfrak{H}_b$, admits an extension to a partial isometry V from $\mathfrak{H}$ to L^2_σ. Then the inclusion $\operatorname{mul} T \subset \ker V$ follows from the proof of Lemma 4.1 in [18]. Note that this proof is based on the method of indivisible intervals, which is not elaborated for the case $\dim H > 1$.

The inclusion (1.14) makes natural the following definition (cf. Definition 1.1).

Definition 1.2. An $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued distribution function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying the condition (C) is called a pseudospectral function of the system (1.2) if $\ker V_\Sigma = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$.

Clearly, a pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ is a spectral function in the sense of [21].

The main result of the paper is a parametrization of all pseudospectral functions in terms of a Nevanlinna boundary parameter. Such a parametrization is obtained for absolutely definite systems satisfying $n_-(T_{\min}) \le n_+(T_{\min})$ (system (1.2) is called absolutely definite if $\mu_1(X_\Delta) > 0$). However to simplify presentation we additionally assume below (within this section) that system is Hamiltonian and $n_-(T_{\min}) = n_+(T_{\min})$. In this case there exist a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_b$ and a surjective linear mapping $\Gamma_b = (\Gamma_{0b}, \Gamma_{1b})^\top : \operatorname{dom} T_{\max} \to \mathcal{H}_b \oplus \mathcal{H}_b$ such that

$$[y,z]_b (= \lim_{t \uparrow b} (Jy(t), z(t))) = (\Gamma_{0b} y, \Gamma_{1b} z) - (\Gamma_{1b} y, \Gamma_{0b} z), \quad y, z \in \operatorname{dom} T_{\max}$$

In fact $\Gamma_b y$ is a singular boundary value of a function $y \in \operatorname{dom} T_{\max}$ (for more details see Remark 3.5 in [1]).

Assume that $\mathcal{H}_b$ and Γ_b are fixed. For a function $y \in \operatorname{dom} T_{\max}$ let $\Gamma'_0 y = \{-y_1(a),\ \Gamma_{0b} y\} \in H \oplus \mathcal{H}_b$ and $\Gamma'_1 y = \{y_0(a), -\Gamma_{1b} y\} \in H \oplus \mathcal{H}_b$, where $y_0(a)$ and $y_1(a)$ are taken from the representation $y(t) = \{y_0(t),\ y_1(t)\} (\in H \oplus H)$ of y. We show that for each generalized resolvent $R(\lambda)$ of $T_{\min}$ there exists a unique Nevanlinna pair $\tau = \{C_0(\lambda), C_1(\lambda)\}$ of operator functions $C_0(\lambda),\ C_1(\lambda) (\in [H \oplus \mathcal{H}_b]),\ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, such that a function $y(t) = (R(\lambda) f)(t),\ f = f(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{H}$, is an L^2_Δ-solution of the following boundary problem:

$$Jy' - B(t) y = \lambda \Delta(t) y + \Delta(t) f(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I} \tag{1.15}$$

$$C_0(\lambda) \Gamma'_0 y - C_1(\lambda) \Gamma'_1 y = 0, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.16}$$

Note, that (1.16) is a boundary condition imposed on boundary values of a function $y \in \operatorname{dom} T_{\max}$. One may consider a Nevanlinna pair τ as a boundary parameter, since $R(\lambda)$ runs over the set of all generalized resolvents of $T_{\min}$ when τ runs over the set of all Nevanlinna pairs $\tau = \{C_0(\lambda), C_1(\lambda)\}$. To indicate this fact explicitly we write $R(\lambda) = R_\tau(\lambda)$ and $\Omega(\lambda) = \Omega_\tau(\lambda)$ for the generalized resolvent of $T_{\min}$ and the corresponding characteristic matrix respectively.

The main result can be formulated in the form of the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *If system* (1.2) *is absolutely definite, then there exist operator functions* $\Omega_0(\lambda) (\in [\mathbb{H}]),\ S(\lambda) (\in [H \oplus \mathcal{H}_b, \mathbb{H}])$ *and a Nevanlinna operator function* $M(\lambda) (\in [H \oplus \mathcal{H}_b]),\ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, *such that the equality*

$$\Omega(\lambda) = \Omega_\tau(\lambda) = \Omega_0(\lambda) + S(\lambda)(C_0(\lambda) - C_1(\lambda) M(\lambda))^{-1} C_1(\lambda) S^*(\overline{\lambda}), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \tag{1.17}$$

together with the Stieltjes formula (1.10) *establishes a bijective correspondence between all boundary parameters* $\tau = \{C_0(\lambda), C_1(\lambda)\}$ *satisfying*

$$\lim_{y\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy}(C_0(iy)-C_1(iy)M(iy))^{-1}C_1(iy) = \lim_{y\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy}M(iy)(C_0(iy)-C_1(iy)M(iy))^{-1}C_0(iy) = 0$$

and all pseudospectral functions $\Sigma(\cdot) = \Sigma_\tau(\cdot)$ *of the system.*

Note that the operator functions $\Omega_0(\cdot)$, $S(\cdot)$ and $M(\cdot)$ in (1.17) are defined in terms of the boundary values of respective L^2_Δ-operator solutions of Eq. (1.4). Observe also that in the case of maximal deficiency indices a description of spectral and pseudospectral functions for certain classes of boundary value problems in the form close to (1.17), (1.10) has been obtained in [10, 12, 14, 15, 19, 27](for regular symmetric systems see [21, 22] and [33]). Moreover, similar to (1.17), (1.10) parametrization of $[H \oplus \widehat{H}]$-valued pseudospectral functions $\Sigma(\cdot)$ of a singular system (1.2) with arbitrary deficiency indices of $T_{\min}$ can be found in recent works [1, 29].

It follows from (1.14) that the set of spectral functions of the system (1.2) is not empty if and only if $\operatorname{mul} T_{\min} = \{0\}$. Moreover, if this condition is satisfied, then the set of spectral functions coincides with the set of pseudospectral functions and, consequently, all the above results hold for spectral functions.

In conclusion note that, in the case of a definite regular Hamiltonian system (1.2), for each pseudospectral function $\Sigma_\varphi(s)(\in [H])$ in the sense of [33, 34] there is a pseudospectral function $\Sigma(s)(\in [H \oplus H])$ in the sense of Definition 1.2 corresponding to appropriate separated boundary conditions (1.16) and such that $\Sigma(s) = \operatorname{diag}(\Sigma_\varphi(s), 0)$. Hence the results from [33, 34] concerning pseudospectral functions of definite systems can be developed by using the results of the present paper (this assertion will be clarified in more details elsewhere).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notations.** The following notations will be used throughout the paper: $\mathfrak{H}$, $\mathcal{H}$ denote Hilbert spaces; $[\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2]$ is the set of all bounded linear operators defined on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1$ with values in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_2$; $[\mathcal{H}] := [\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}]$; $P_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the orthoprojection in $\mathfrak{H}$ onto the subspace $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathfrak{H}$; $\mathbb{C}_+$ ($\mathbb{C}_-$) is the upper (lower) half-plane of the complex plane.

Recall that a closed linear relation from $\mathcal{H}_0$ to $\mathcal{H}_1$ is a closed linear subspace in $\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1$. The set of all closed linear relations from $\mathcal{H}_0$ to $\mathcal{H}_1$ (in $\mathcal{H}$) will be denoted by $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ ($\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H})$). A closed linear operator T from $\mathcal{H}_0$ to $\mathcal{H}_1$ is identified with its graph $\operatorname{gr} T \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$.

For a linear relation $T \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ we denote by $\operatorname{dom} T$, $\operatorname{ran} T$, $\ker T$ and $\operatorname{mul} T$ the domain, range, kernel and the multivalued part of T respectively. Recall that $\operatorname{mul} T$ ia a subspace in $\mathcal{H}_1$ defined by

$$\operatorname{mul} T := \{h_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1 : \{0, h_1\} \in T\}.$$

Clearly, $T \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ is an operator if and only if $\operatorname{mul} T = \{0\}$. The inverse and adjoint linear relations of T are the relations $T^{-1} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_0)$ and $T^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_0)$ defined by

$$T^{-1} = \{\{h_1, h_0\} \in \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_0 : \{h_0, h_1\} \in T\}$$
$$T^* = \{\{k_1, k_0\} \in \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_0 : \ (k_0, h_0) - (k_1, h_1) = 0, \ \{h_0, h_1\} \in T\}.$$

Recall also that an operator function $\Phi(\cdot) : \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \to [\mathcal{H}]$ is called a Nevanlinna function if it is holomorphic and satisfies $\operatorname{Im}\lambda \cdot \operatorname{Im}\Phi(\lambda) \geq 0$ and $\Phi^*(\lambda) = \Phi(\overline{\lambda}), \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$.

2.2. **Symmetric relations and generalized resolvents.** Recall that a linear relation $A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{H})$ is called symmetric (self-adjoint) if $A \subset A^*$ (resp. $A = A^*$). For each symmetric relation $A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{H})$ the following decompositions hold

$$\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_0 \oplus \operatorname{mul} A, \qquad A = \operatorname{gr} A_0 \oplus \widehat{\operatorname{mul}}\, A,$$

where $\widehat{\operatorname{mul}}\, A = \{0\} \oplus \operatorname{mul} A$ and A_0 is a closed symmetric not necessarily densely defined operator in $\mathfrak{H}_0$ (the operator part of A). Moreover, $A = A^*$ if and only if $A_0 = A_0^*$.

Let $A = A^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{H})$, let $\mathcal{B}$ be the Borel σ-algebra of $\mathbb{R}$ and let $E_0(\cdot) : \mathcal{B} \to [\mathfrak{H}_0]$ be the orthogonal spectral measure of A_0. Then the spectral measure $E_A(\cdot) : \mathcal{B} \to [\mathfrak{H}]$ of A is defined as $E_A(B) = E_0(B)P_{\mathfrak{H}_0},\ B \in \mathcal{B}$.

Definition 2.1. Let $\widetilde{A} = \widetilde{A}^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}})$ and let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a subspace in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$. The relation $\widetilde{A}$ is called $\mathfrak{H}$-minimal if $\overline{\operatorname{span}}\{\mathfrak{H}, (\widetilde{A} - \lambda)^{-1}\mathfrak{H} : \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}\} = \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$.

Definition 2.2. The relations $T_j \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{H}_j),\ j \in \{1, 2\}$, are said to be unitarily equivalent (by means of a unitary operator $U \in [\mathfrak{H}_1, \mathfrak{H}_2]$) if $T_2 = \widetilde{U}T_1$ with $\widetilde{U} = U \oplus U \in [\mathfrak{H}_1^2, \mathfrak{H}_2^2]$.

Let $A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{H})$ be a symmetric relation. Recall the following definitions and results.

Definition 2.3. A relation $\widetilde{A} = \widetilde{A}^*$ in a Hilbert space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} \supset \mathfrak{H}$ satisfying $A \subset \widetilde{A}$ is called an exit space self-adjoint extension of A. Moreover, such an extension $\widetilde{A}$ is called minimal if it is $\mathfrak{H}$-minimal.

In what follows we denote by $\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(A)$ the set of all minimal exit space self-adjoint extensions of A. Moreover, we denote by $\operatorname{Self}(A)$ the set of all extensions $\widetilde{A} = \widetilde{A}^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{H})$ of A (such an extension is called canonical). As is known, for each A one has $\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(A) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $\operatorname{Self}(A) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if A has equal deficiency indices, in which case $\operatorname{Self}(A) \subset \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(A)$.

Definition 2.4. Exit space extensions $\widetilde{A}_j = \widetilde{A}_j^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_j),\ j \in \{1, 2\}$, of A are called equivalent (with respect to $\mathfrak{H}$) if there exists a unitary operator $V \in [\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_1 \ominus \mathfrak{H}, \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_2 \ominus \mathfrak{H}]$ such that $\widetilde{A}_1$ and $\widetilde{A}_2$ are unitarily equivalent by means of $U = I_{\mathfrak{H}} \oplus V$.

Definition 2.5. The operator functions $R(\cdot) : \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \to [\mathfrak{H}]$ and $F(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathfrak{H}]$ are called a generalized resolvent and a spectral function of A respectively if there exists an exit space extension $\widetilde{A}$ of A (in a certain Hilbert space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} \supset \mathfrak{H}$) such that

$$R(\lambda) = P_{\mathfrak{H}}(\widetilde{A} - \lambda)^{-1} \restriction \mathfrak{H}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \tag{2.1}$$

$$F(t) = P_{\mathfrak{H}}E((-\infty, t)) \restriction \mathfrak{H}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.2}$$

Here $P_{\mathfrak{H}}$ is the orthoprojection in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ onto $\mathfrak{H}$ and $E(\cdot)$ is the spectral measure of $\widetilde{A}$.

In the case $\widetilde{A} \in \operatorname{Self}(A)$ the equality (2.1) defines a canonical resolvent $R(\lambda) = (\widetilde{A} - \lambda)^{-1}$ of A.

Proposition 2.6. *Each generalized resolvent $R(\lambda)$ of A is generated by some (minimal) extension $\widetilde{A} \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(A)$. Moreover, the extensions $\widetilde{A}_1, \widetilde{A}_2 \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(A)$ inducing the same generalized resolvent $R(\cdot)$ are equivalent.*

In the sequel we suppose that a generalized resolvent $R(\cdot)$ and a spectral function $F(\cdot)$ are generated by an extension $\widetilde{A} \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(A)$. Moreover, we identify equivalent extensions. Then by Proposition 2.6 the equality (2.1) gives a bijective correspondence between generalized

resolvents $R(\lambda)$ and extensions $\widetilde{A} \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}(A)$, so that each $\widetilde{A} \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}(A)$ is uniquely defined by the corresponding generalized resolvent (2.1) (spectral function (2.2)).

It follows from (2.1) and (2.2) that the generalized resolvent $R(\cdot)$ and the spectral function $F(\cdot)$ generated by an extension $\widetilde{A} \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}(A)$ are related by

$$R(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dF(t)}{t-\lambda}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, setting $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0 = \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} \ominus \operatorname{mul} \widetilde{A}$ one gets from (2.2) that

$$F(\infty)(:= s - \lim_{t\to+\infty} F(t)) = P_{\mathfrak{H}} P_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0} \restriction \mathfrak{H}. \tag{2.3}$$

2.3. **The spaces $\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$ and $L^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$.** Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite dimensional Hilbert space. A non-decreasing operator function $\Sigma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathcal{H}]$ is called a distribution function if it is left continuous and satisfies $\Sigma(0) = 0$.

Theorem 2.7. [9, ch. 3.15], [16] *Let $\Sigma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathcal{H}]$ be a distribution function. Then:*

(1) *There exist a scalar measure σ on Borel sets of $\mathbb{R}$ and a function $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathcal{H}]$ (uniquely defined by σ up to σ-a.e.) such that $\Psi(s) \geq 0$ σ-a.e. on $\mathbb{R}$, $\sigma([\alpha,\beta)) < \infty$ and $\Sigma(\beta) - \Sigma(\alpha) = \int\limits_{[\alpha,\beta)} \Psi(s)\, d\sigma(s)$ for any finite interval $[\alpha,\beta) \subset \mathbb{R}$.*

(2) *The set $\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$ of all Borel-measurable functions $f(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{H}$ satisfying*

$$||f||^2_{\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (d\Sigma(s) f(s), f(s)) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\Psi(s) f(s), f(s))_{\mathcal{H}}\, d\sigma(s) < \infty$$

is a semi-Hilbert space with the semi-scalar product

$$(f,g)_{\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (d\Sigma(s) f(s), g(s)) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\Psi(s) f(s), g(s))_{\mathcal{H}}\, d\sigma(s), \quad f,g \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H}).$$

Moreover, different measures σ from statement (1) give rise to the same space $\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$.

Definition 2.8. [9, 16] The Hilbert space $L^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$ is a Hilbert space of all equivalence classes in $\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$ with respect to the seminorm $||\cdot||_{\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})}$.

In the following we denote by π_Σ the quotient map from $\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$ onto $L^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, we denote by $\mathcal{L}^2_{loc}(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$ the set of all functions $g \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$ with the compact support and we put $L^2_{loc}(\Sigma;\mathcal{H}) := \pi_\Sigma \mathcal{L}^2_{loc}(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$.

With a distribution function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ one associates the multiplication operator $\Lambda = \Lambda_\Sigma$ in $L^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\operatorname{dom}\Lambda_\Sigma = \{\widetilde{f} \in L^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H}) : sf(s) \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H}) \text{ for some (and hence for all) } f(\cdot) \in \widetilde{f}\}$$

$$\Lambda_\Sigma \widetilde{f} = \pi_\Sigma(sf(s)), \quad \widetilde{f} \in \operatorname{dom}\Lambda_\Sigma, \quad f(\cdot) \in \widetilde{f}. \tag{2.4}$$

As is known, $\Lambda^*_\Sigma = \Lambda_\Sigma$ and the spectral measure E_Σ of Λ_Σ is given by

$$E_\Sigma(B)\widetilde{f} = \pi_\Sigma(\chi_B(\cdot) f(\cdot)), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}, \quad \widetilde{f} \in L^2(\Sigma;\mathcal{H}), \quad f(\cdot) \in \widetilde{f}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\chi_B(\cdot)$ is the indicator of the Borel set B.

Let $\mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{K}'$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be finite dimensional Hilbert spaces and let $\Sigma(s)(\in [\mathcal{H}])$ be a distribution function. For Borel measurable functions $Y(s)(\in [\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}])$, $g(s)(\in \mathcal{H})$ and $Z(s)(\in$

$[\mathcal{K}', \mathcal{H}])$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we let

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} Y(s)d\Sigma(s)g(s) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y(s)\Psi(s)g(s)\,d\sigma(s)\,(\in \mathcal{K}) \tag{2.6}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} Y(s)d\Sigma(s)Z(s) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y(s)\Psi(s)Z(s)\,d\sigma(s)\,(\in [\mathcal{K}', \mathcal{K}]), \tag{2.7}$$

where σ and $\Psi(\cdot)$ are defined in Theorem 2.7, (1).

2.4. **The classes $\widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\widetilde{R}(\mathcal{H})$.** Let $\mathcal{H}_0$ be a Hilbert space, let $\mathcal{H}_1$ be a subspace in $\mathcal{H}_0$ and let $\tau = \{\tau_+, \tau_-\}$ be a collection of holomorphic functions $\tau_\pm(\cdot) : \mathbb{C}_\pm \to \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$. In the paper we systematically deal with collections $\tau = \{\tau_+, \tau_-\}$ of the special class $\widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$. Definition and detailed characterization of this class can be found in our paper [30] (see also [25, 28, 1], where the notation $\widetilde{R}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ were used instead of $\widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$). If $\dim \mathcal{H}_1 < \infty$, then according to [30] the collection $\tau = \{\tau_+, \tau_-\} \in \widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ admits the representation

$$\tau_+(\lambda) = \{(C_0(\lambda), C_1(\lambda)); \mathcal{H}_0\},\ \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+; \quad \tau_-(\lambda) = \{(D_0(\lambda), D_1(\lambda)); \mathcal{H}_1\},\ \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_- \tag{2.8}$$

by means of two pairs of holomorphic operator functions

$$(C_0(\lambda), C_1(\lambda)) : \mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_0,\ \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+,\ \text{ and }\ (D_0(\lambda), D_1(\lambda)) : \mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_1,\ \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-$$

(more precisely, by equivalence classes of such pairs). The equalities (2.8) mean that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_+(\lambda) &= \{\{h_0, h_1\} \in \mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1 : C_0(\lambda)h_0 + C_1(\lambda)h_1 = 0\}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+ \\ \tau_-(\lambda) &= \{\{h_0, h_1\} \in \mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1 : D_0(\lambda)h_0 + D_1(\lambda)h_1 = 0\}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-. \end{aligned}$$

In [30] the class $\widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ is characterized both in terms of $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$-valued functions $\tau_\pm(\cdot)$ and in terms of operator functions $C_j(\cdot)$ and $D_j(\cdot)$, $j \in \{0, 1\}$, from (2.8).

If $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_0 =: \mathcal{H}$, then the class $\widetilde{R}(\mathcal{H}) := \widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$ coincides with the well-known class of Nevanlinna $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{H})$-valued functions $\tau(\cdot)$ (see, for instance, [4]). In this case the collection (2.8) turns into the Nevanlinna pair

$$\tau(\lambda) = \{(C_0(\lambda), C_1(\lambda)); \mathcal{H}\}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.9}$$

with $C_0(\lambda), C_1(\lambda) \in [\mathcal{H}]$. Recall also that the subclass $\widetilde{R}^0(\mathcal{H}) \subset \widetilde{R}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as the set of all $\tau(\cdot) \in \widetilde{R}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\tau(\lambda) \equiv \theta (= \theta^*)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. This implies that $\tau(\cdot) \in \widetilde{R}^0(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if

$$\tau(\lambda) \equiv \{(C_0, C_1); \mathcal{H}\}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.10}$$

with some operators $C_0, C_1 \in [\mathcal{H}]$ satisfying $\operatorname{Im}(C_1C_0^*) = 0$ and $0 \in \rho(C_0 \pm iC_1)$ (for more details see e.g. [1, Remark 2.5]).

2.5. **Boundary triplets and Weyl functions.** Here we recall definitions of a boundary triplet and the corresponding Weyl function of a symmetric relation following [6, 24, 26, 30].

Let A be a closed symmetric linear relation in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$, let $\mathfrak{N}_\lambda(A) = \ker(A^* - \lambda)$ $(\lambda \in \mathbb{C})$ be a defect subspace of A, let $\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_\lambda(A) = \{\{f, \lambda f\} : f \in \mathfrak{N}_\lambda(A)\}$ and let $n_\pm(A) := \dim \mathfrak{N}_\lambda(A) \le \infty$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_\pm$, be deficiency indices of A.

Next, assume that $\mathcal{H}_0$ is a Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}_1$ is a subspace in $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_2 := \mathcal{H}_0 \ominus \mathcal{H}_1$, so that $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$. Denote by P_j the orthoprojection in $\mathcal{H}_0$ onto $\mathcal{H}_j$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Definition 2.9. A collection $\Pi_+ = \{\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$, where $\Gamma_j : A^* \to \mathcal{H}_j,\ j \in \{0,1\}$, are linear mappings, is called a boundary triplet for A^*, if the mapping $\Gamma : \widehat{f} \to \{\Gamma_0\widehat{f}, \Gamma_1\widehat{f}\}, \widehat{f} \in A^*$, from A^* into $\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1$ is surjective and the following Green's identity holds

$$(f', g) - (f, g') = (\Gamma_1\widehat{f}, \Gamma_0\widehat{g})_{\mathcal{H}_0} - (\Gamma_0\widehat{f}, \Gamma_1\widehat{g})_{\mathcal{H}_0} + i(P_2\Gamma_0\widehat{f}, P_2\Gamma_0\widehat{g})_{\mathcal{H}_2}$$

holds for all $\widehat{f} = \{f, f'\},\ \widehat{g} = \{g, g'\} \in A^*$.

According to [26] a boundary triplet $\Pi_+ = \{\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ for A^* exists if and only if $n_-(A) \le n_+(A)$, in which case $\dim \mathcal{H}_1 = n_-(A)$ and $\dim \mathcal{H}_0 = n_+(A)$.

Proposition 2.10. [26] *Let $\Pi_+ = \{\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ be a boundary triplet for A^*. Then the equalities*

$$\Gamma_1 \upharpoonright \widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_\lambda(A) = M_+(\lambda)\Gamma_0 \upharpoonright \widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_\lambda(A), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$$
$$(\Gamma_1 + iP_2\Gamma_0) \upharpoonright \widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_\lambda(A) = M_-(\lambda)P_1\Gamma_0 \upharpoonright \widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_\lambda(A), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-$$

correctly define the (holomorphic) operator functions $M_+(\cdot) : \mathbb{C}_+ \to [\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1]$ and $M_-(\cdot) : \mathbb{C}_- \to [\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_0]$ satisfying $M_+^*(\overline{\lambda}) = M_-(\lambda),\ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-$.

Definition 2.11. [26] The operator functions $M_\pm(\cdot)$ defined in Proposition 2.10 are called the Weyl functions corresponding to the boundary triplet Π_+.

Theorem 2.12. [26] *Let A be a closed symmetric linear relation in $\mathfrak{H}$, let $\Pi_+ = \{\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ be a boundary triplet for A^* and let $M_+(\cdot)$ be the corresponding Weyl function. If $\tau = \{\tau_+, \tau_-\} \in \widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ is a collection of holomorphic pairs (2.8), then for every $g \in \mathfrak{H}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ the abstract boundary value problem*

$$\{f, \lambda f + g\} \in A^* \tag{2.11}$$
$$C_0(\lambda)\Gamma_0\{f, \lambda f + g\} - C_1(\lambda)\Gamma_1\{f, \lambda f + g\} = 0, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+ \tag{2.12}$$
$$D_0(\lambda)\Gamma_0\{f, \lambda f + g\} - D_1(\lambda)\Gamma_1\{f, \lambda f + g\} = 0, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_- \tag{2.13}$$

has a unique solution $f = f(g, \lambda)$ and the equality $R(\lambda)g := f(g, \lambda)$ defines a generalized resolvent $R(\lambda) = R_\tau(\lambda)$ of A. Moreover, $0 \in \rho(\tau_+(\lambda) + M_+(\lambda))$ and the following Krein-Naimark formula for resolvents is valid:

$$R_\tau(\lambda) = (A_0 - \lambda)^{-1} - \gamma_+(\lambda)(\tau_+(\lambda) + M_+(\lambda))^{-1}\gamma_-^*(\overline{\lambda}), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+ \tag{2.14}$$

Conversely, for each generalized resolvent $R(\lambda)$ of A there exists a unique $\tau \in \widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ such that $R(\lambda) = R_\tau(\lambda)$ and, consequently, the equality (2.14) is valid.

Remark 2.13. It follows from Theorem 2.12 that the boundary value problem (2.11)–(2.13) as well as formula for resolvents (2.14) give a parametrization of all generalized resolvents

$$R(\lambda) = R_\tau(\lambda) = P_{\mathfrak{H}}(\widetilde{A}^\tau - \lambda)^{-1} \upharpoonright \mathfrak{H}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.15}$$

and, consequently, all (minimal) exit space self-adjoint extensions $\widetilde{A} = \widetilde{A}^\tau$ of A by means of an abstract boundary parameter $\tau \in \widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$.

Theorem 2.14. *Let under the assumptions of Theorem 2.12 $\tau = \{\tau_+, \tau_-\} \in \widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)$ be a collection of holomorphic pairs (2.8) and let $\widetilde{A}^\tau \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}})$ be the corresponding exit space self-adjoint extension of A (see remark 2.13). Then:*

(1) *The equalities*

$$\Phi_\tau(\lambda) := P_1(C_0(\lambda) - C_1(\lambda)M_+(\lambda))^{-1}C_1(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+ \tag{2.16}$$

$$\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\lambda) = M_+(\lambda)(C_0(\lambda) - C_1(\lambda)M_+(\lambda))^{-1}C_0(\lambda) \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}_1, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+ \tag{2.17}$$

define holomorphic $[\mathcal{H}_1]$*-valued functions* $\Phi_\tau(\cdot)$ *and* $\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\cdot)$ *on* $\mathbb{C}_+$ *satisfying* $\operatorname{Im}\Phi_\tau(\lambda) \geq 0$ *and* $\operatorname{Im}\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\lambda) \geq 0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ *. Hence there exist strong limits*

$$\mathcal{B}_\tau := s - \lim_{y\to+\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy} P_1(C_0(iy) - C_1(iy)M_+(iy))^{-1}C_1(iy) \tag{2.18}$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\tau := s - \lim_{y\to+\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy} M_+(iy)(C_0(iy) - C_1(iy)M_+(iy))^{-1}C_0(iy) \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}_1 \tag{2.19}$$

(2) The extension $\widetilde{A}^\tau$ satisfies $\operatorname{mul}\widetilde{A}^\tau = \operatorname{mul} A$ if and only if $\mathcal{B}_\tau = \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\tau = 0$

Proof. Statement (1) for $\Phi_\tau(\lambda)$ was proved in [30, Theorem 4.8].

Next assume that

$$C_0(\lambda) = (C_{01}(\lambda), C_{02}(\lambda)) : \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_0, \quad D_0(\lambda) = (D_{01}(\lambda), D_{02}(\lambda)) : \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_1$$

$$M_+(\lambda) = (M(\lambda), N_+(\lambda)) : \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_1, \quad M_-(\lambda) = (M(\lambda), N_-(\lambda))^\top : \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$$

are the block-matrix representations of $C_0(\lambda)$, $C_1(\lambda)$ and $M_\pm(\lambda)$. Moreover,let

$$\widehat{C}_0(\lambda) = (C_1(\lambda), C_{02}(\lambda)) : \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_0; \quad \widehat{C}_1(\lambda) = -C_{01}(\lambda), \ \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$$

$$\widehat{M}_+(\lambda) = (-M^{-1}(\lambda), -M^{-1}(\lambda)N_+(\lambda)) : \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_1, \ \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$$

Then according to [30] the equalities

$$\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\lambda) := P_1(\widehat{C}_0(\lambda) - \widehat{C}_1(\lambda)\widehat{M}_+(\lambda))^{-1}\widehat{C}_1(\lambda), \ \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+; \quad \widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\lambda) := \widehat{\Phi}_\tau^*(\overline{\lambda}), \ \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_- \tag{2.20}$$

define a Nevanlinna function $\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\cdot) : \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \to [\mathcal{H}_1]$ (i.e., a holomorphic function $\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\cdot)$ such that $\operatorname{Im}\lambda \cdot \operatorname{Im}\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\lambda) \geq 0$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_\tau^*(\lambda) = \widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\overline{\lambda})$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$). The immediate checking shows that

$$(P_2 - M_+(\lambda))^{-1} = -M^{-1}(\lambda)P_1 - M^{-1}(\lambda)N_+(\lambda)P_2 + P_2$$

and, consequently, $P_1(P_2 - M_+(\lambda))^{-1} = \widehat{M}_+(\lambda)$ (here $M_+(\lambda)$ is considered as the operator in $\mathcal{H}_0$). This and (2.20) imply that for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$

$$\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\lambda) = -P_1\left(C_1(\lambda)P_1 + C_{02}(\lambda)P_2 + C_{01}(\lambda)P_1(P_2 - M_+(\lambda))^{-1}\right)^{-1} C_{01}(\lambda) =$$

$$-P_1(P_2 - M_+(\lambda))\big((C_1(\lambda)P_1 + C_{02}(\lambda)P_2)(P_2 - M_+(\lambda)) + C_{01}(\lambda)P_1\big)^{-1}C_{01}(\lambda) =$$

$$M_+(\lambda)(C_{02}(\lambda)P_2 - C_1(\lambda)M_+(\lambda) + C_{01}(\lambda)P_1)^{-1}C_{01}(\lambda) =$$

$$M_+(\lambda)(C_0(\lambda) - C_1(\lambda)M_+(\lambda))^{-1}C_0(\lambda) \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}_1.$$

Thus the restriction of $\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{C}_+$ admits the representation (2.17), which yields statement (1) for $\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\lambda)$.

It was shown in [30] that the second equality in (2.20) can be written as

$$\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(\lambda) := M(\lambda)(D_{01}(\lambda) - D_1(\lambda)M(\lambda) - iD_{02}(\lambda)N_-(\lambda))^{-1}D_{01}(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-$$

Therefore by (2.19) one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\tau = s - \lim_{y\to+\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy}\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(iy) = s - \lim_{y\to-\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy}\widehat{\Phi}_\tau(iy) =$$

$$s - \lim_{y\to-\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy} M(iy)(D_{01}(iy) - D_1(iy)M(iy) - iD_{02}(iy)N_-(iy))^{-1}D_{01}(iy).$$

Now statement (2) follows from [30, Theorem 4.9]. □

Remark 2.15. (1) If $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_1 := \mathcal{H}$, then the boundary triplet in the sense of Definition 2.9 turns into the boundary triplet $\Pi = \{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ for A^* in the sense of [13, 24]. In this case $n_+(A) = n_-(A) (= \dim \mathcal{H})$ and $M_\pm(\cdot)$ turn into the Weyl function $M(\cdot) : \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \to [\mathcal{H}]$ introduced in [6, 24]. Moreover, in this case $M(\cdot)$ is a Nevanlinna operator function.

In the sequel a boundary triplet $\Pi = \{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ in the sense of [13, 24] will be called an *ordinary boundary triplet* for A^*.

(2) Let $n_+(A) = n_-(A)$, let $\Pi = \{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ be an ordinary boundary triplet for A^* and let $M(\cdot)$ be the corresponding Weyl function. Then an abstract boundary parameter τ in Theorem 2.12 is a Nevanlinna operator pair $\tau \in \widetilde{R}(\mathcal{H})$ of the form (2.9) and the equalities (2.18) and (2.19) take the form

$$\mathcal{B}_\tau = s - \lim_{y\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy}(C_0(iy) - C_1(iy)M(iy))^{-1}C_1(iy) \tag{2.21}$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\tau = s - \lim_{y\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{iy}M(iy)(C_0(iy) - C_1(iy)M(iy))^{-1}C_0(iy). \tag{2.22}$$

Note that for this case Theorem 2.14 was proved in [4, 5].

3. First-order symmetric systems

3.1. **Notations.** Let $\mathcal{I} = [a, b\rangle$ $(-\infty < a < b \le \infty)$ be an interval of the real line (the symbol $\rangle$ means that the endpoint $b < \infty$ might be either included to $\mathcal{I}$ or not). For a given finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$ denote by $AC(\mathcal{I}; \mathbb{H})$ the set of functions $f(\cdot) : \mathcal{I} \to \mathbb{H}$ which are absolutely continuous on each segment $[a, \beta] \subset \mathcal{I}$.

Next assume that $\Delta(\cdot)$ is an $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued Borel measurable function on $\mathcal{I}$ integrable on each compact interval $[a, \beta] \subset \mathcal{I}$ and such that $\Delta(t) \ge 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ the semi-Hilbert space of Borel measurable functions $f(\cdot) : \mathcal{I} \to \mathbb{H}$ satisfying $||f||^2_\Delta := \int_{\mathcal{I}} (\Delta(t)f(t), f(t))_{\mathbb{H}}\, dt < \infty$ (see e.g. [9, Chapter 13.5]). The semi-definite inner product $(\cdot,\cdot)_\Delta$ in $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ is defined by $(f, g)_\Delta = \int_{\mathcal{I}} (\Delta(t)f(t), g(t))_{\mathbb{H}}\, dt$, $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$. Moreover, let $L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ be the Hilbert space of the equivalence classes in $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ with respect to the semi-norm $||\cdot||_\Delta$ and let π_Δ be the quotient map from $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ onto $L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$.

For a given finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ we denote by $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta[\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{H}]$ the set of all Borel measurable operator-functions $F(\cdot) : \mathcal{I} \to [\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{H}]$ such that $F(t)h \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$, $h \in \mathcal{K}$.

3.2. **Symmetric systems.** In this subsection we provide some known results on symmetric systems of differential equations following [11, 18, 23, 32].

Let H and $\widehat{H}$ be finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces and let

$$H_0 = H \oplus \widehat{H}, \quad \mathbb{H} = H_0 \oplus H = H \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus H. \tag{3.1}$$

Let as above $\mathcal{I} = [a, b\rangle$ $(-\infty < a < b \le \infty)$ be an interval in $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover, let $B(\cdot)$ and $\Delta(\cdot)$ be $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued Borel measurable functions on $\mathcal{I}$ integrable on each compact interval $[a, \beta] \subset \mathcal{I}$ and satisfying $B(t) = B^*(t)$ and $\Delta(t) \ge 0$ a.e. on $\mathcal{I}$ and let $J \in [\mathbb{H}]$ be operator (1.3).

A first-order symmetric system on an interval $\mathcal{I}$ (with the regular endpoint a) is a system of differential equations of the form

$$Jy' - B(t)y = \Delta(t)f(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$. Together with (3.2) we consider also the homogeneous system

$$Jy'(t) - B(t)y(t) = \lambda\Delta(t)y(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{3.3}$$

A function $y \in AC(\mathcal{I};\mathbb{H})$ is a solution of (3.2) (resp. (3.3)) if equality (3.2) (resp. (3.3) holds a.e. on $\mathcal{I}$. A function $Y(\cdot,\lambda):\mathcal{I}\to[\mathcal{K},\mathbb{H}]$ is an operator solution of equation (3.3) if $y(t)=Y(t,\lambda)h$ is a (vector) solution of this equation for every $h\in\mathcal{K}$ (here $\mathcal{K}$ is a Hilbert space with $\dim\mathcal{K}<\infty$).

The following lemma will be useful in the sequel.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a finite dimensional Hilbert space, let $Y(\cdot,\cdot):\mathcal{I}\times\mathbb{R}\to[\mathcal{K},\mathbb{H}]$ be an operator function such that $Y(\cdot,s)$ is a solution of (3.3) and $Y(a,\cdot)$ is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$ and let $\Sigma(\cdot):\mathbb{R}\to[\mathcal{K}]$ be a distribution function. Then for each function $g\in\mathcal{L}^2_{loc}(\Sigma;\mathcal{K})$ the equality*

$$f(t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}} Y(t,s)\,d\Sigma(s)g(s),\quad t\in\mathcal{I} \tag{3.4}$$

defines a function $f(\cdot)\in AC(\mathcal{I};\mathbb{H})$ such that

$$f'(t)=-J\int_{\mathbb{R}}(B(t)+s\Delta(t))Y(t,s)\,d\Sigma(s)g(s)\quad(\text{a.e.on }\mathcal{I}). \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. According to (2.6) the equality (3.4) means

$$f(t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}} Y(t,s)\Psi(s)g(s)\,d\sigma(s),\quad t\in\mathcal{I}, \tag{3.6}$$

where Ψ and σ are defined in Theorem 2.7, (1). Since $Y(t,s)$ satisfies

$$Y(t,s)=Y(a,s)-J\int_{[a,t)}(B(u)+s\Delta(u))Y(u,s)du,\quad t\in\mathcal{I}, \tag{3.7}$$

it follows that $Y(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a continuous function on $\mathcal{I}\times\mathbb{R}$. Moreover, one can easily prove that $\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}||\Psi(s)g(s)||\,d\sigma(s)<\infty$. Therefore the integral in (3.6) exists and

$$\int\limits_{[a,t)\times\mathbb{R}}||(B(u)+s\Delta(u))Y(u,s)\Psi(s)g(s)||\,du\,d\sigma(s)<\infty. \tag{3.8}$$

It follows from (3.8) and the Fubini theorem that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(\int_{[a,t)}(B(u)+s\Delta(u))Y(u,s)\Psi(s)g(s)\,du\right)d\sigma(s)= \int_{[a,t)}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}(B(u)+s\Delta(u))Y(u,s)\Psi(s)g(s)\,d\sigma(s)\right)du. \tag{3.9}$$

Now combining (3.6) with (3.7) and taking (3.9) into account one gets

$$f(t)=C-J\int_{[a,t)}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}(B(u)+s\Delta(u))Y(u,s)\Psi(s)g(s)\,d\sigma(s)\right)du,$$

where $C=\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}Y(a,s)\Psi(s)g(s)\,d\sigma(s)$. Hence $f(\cdot)\in AC(\mathcal{I};\mathbb{H})$ and (3.5) holds. □

In what follows we always assume that system (3.2) is definite in the sense of the following definition.

Definition 3.2. [11] Symmetric system (3.2) is called definite if for each $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$ and each solution y of (3.3) the equality $\Delta(t)y(t)=0$ (a.e. on $\mathcal{I}$) implies $y(t)=0$, $t\in\mathcal{I}$.

Introduce also the following definition.

Definition 3.3. System (3.2) will be called absolutely definite if

$$\mu_1(\{t \in \mathcal{I} : \text{ the operator } \Delta(t) \text{ is invertible}\}) > 0,$$

where μ_1 is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{I}$.

Clearly, each absolutely definite system is definite. Moreover, one can easily construct definite, but not absolutely definite system (3.2) (even with $B(t) \equiv 0$ and continuous $\Delta(t)$).

As it is known [32, 18, 23] definite system (3.2) gives rise to the *maximal linear relations* $\mathcal{T}_{\max}$ and $T_{\max}$ in $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and $L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$, respectively. They are given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\max} = \{\{y, f\} \in (\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I}))^2 : y \in AC(\mathcal{I}; \mathbb{H}) \text{ and } Jy'(t) - B(t)y(t) = \Delta(t)f(t) \text{ a.e. on } \mathcal{I}\}$$

and $T_{\max} = \{\{\pi_\Delta y, \pi_\Delta f\} : \{y, f\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\max}\}$. Moreover the Lagrange's identity

$$(f, z)_\Delta - (y, g)_\Delta = [y, z]_b - (Jy(a), z(a)), \quad \{y, f\}, \{z, g\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\max}.$$

holds with

$$[y, z]_b := \lim_{t \uparrow b} (Jy(t), z(t)), \quad y, z \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}. \tag{3.10}$$

Formula (3.10) defines the skew-Hermitian bilinear form $[\cdot, \cdot]_b$ on $\operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}$. By using this form one defines the *minimal relations* $\mathcal{T}_{\min}$ in $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and $T_{\min}$ in $L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ via

$$\mathcal{T}_{\min} = \{\{y, f\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\max} : y(a) = 0 \text{ and } [y, z]_b = 0 \text{ for each } z \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}\}.$$

and $T_{\min} = \{\{\pi_\Delta y, \pi_\Delta f\} : \{y, f\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\min}\}$. According to [32, 18, 23] $T_{\min}$ is a closed symmetric linear relation in $L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and $T^*_{\min} = T_{\max}$.

Denote by $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, the linear space of solutions of the homogeneous system (3.3) belonging to $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and let $\mathfrak{N}_\lambda(T_{\min})$ be the defect subspace of $T_{\min}$. Since system (3.2) is definite, it follows that $\dim \mathfrak{N}_\lambda(T_{\min}) = \dim \mathcal{N}_\lambda$. Hence $T_{\min}$ has finite (not necessarily equal) deficiency indices $n_\pm(T_{\min}) = \dim \mathcal{N}_\lambda \le \dim \mathbb{H}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_\pm$.

The following assertion is immediate from definitions of $T_{\min}$ and $T_{\max}$.

Assertion 3.4. (1) *The multivalued part* $\operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$ *of the minimal relation* $T_{\min}$ *is the set of all* $\widetilde{f} \in L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ *such that for some (and hence for all)* $f \in \widetilde{f}$ *the solution* y *of Eq.* (3.3) *with* $y(a) = 0$ *satisfies*

$$y \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I}), \quad \Delta(t)y(t) = 0 \text{ (a.e. on } \mathcal{I}) \text{ and } [y, z]_b = 0, \ z \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}.$$

(2) *The equality* $\operatorname{mul} T_{\min} = \operatorname{mul} T_{\max}$ *holds if and only if for each function* $y \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}$ *the equality* $\Delta(t)y(t) = 0$ *(a.e. on* $\mathcal{I}$*) yields* $y(a) = 0$ *and* $[y, z]_b = 0$, $z \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}$.

Remark 3.5. It is known (see e.g. [23]) that the maximal relation $T_{\max}$ induced by the definite symmetric system (3.2) possesses the following property: for any $\{\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{f}\} \in T_{\max}$ there exists a unique function $y \in AC(\mathcal{I}; \mathbb{H}) \cap \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ such that $y \in \widetilde{y}$ and $\{y, f\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\max}$ for any $f \in \widetilde{f}$. Below we associate such a function $y \in AC(\mathcal{I}; \mathbb{H}) \cap \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ with each pair $\{\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{f}\} \in T_{\max}$.

3.3. **Decomposing boundary triplets.** In this subsection we provide some results from [1].

Lemma 3.6. *If $n_-(T_{\min}) \le n_+(T_{\min})$, then there exist a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b$, a subspace $\mathcal{H}_b \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b$ and a surjective linear mapping*

$$\Gamma_b = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{0b} \\ \widehat{\Gamma}_b \\ \Gamma_{1b} \end{pmatrix} : \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}_b \tag{3.11}$$

such that for all $y, z \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}$ the following identity is valid

$$[y,z]_b = (\Gamma_{0b}y, \Gamma_{1b}z)_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b} - (\Gamma_{1b}y, \Gamma_{0b}z)_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b} + i(P_{\mathcal{H}_b^\perp}\Gamma_{0b}y, P_{\mathcal{H}_b^\perp}\Gamma_{0b}z)_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b} + i(\widehat{\Gamma}_b y, \widehat{\Gamma}_b z)_{\widehat{H}} \tag{3.12}$$

(here $\mathcal{H}_b^\perp = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b \ominus \mathcal{H}_b$). Moreover, in the case $n_+(T_{\min}) = n_-(T_{\min})$ (and only in this case) one has $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b = \mathcal{H}_b$ and the identity (3.12) *takes the form*

$$[y,z]_b = (\Gamma_{0b}y, \Gamma_{1b}z)_{\mathcal{H}_b} - (\Gamma_{1b}y, \Gamma_{0b}z)_{\mathcal{H}_b} + i(\widehat{\Gamma}_b y, \widehat{\Gamma}_b z)_{\widehat{H}}$$

Up to the end of this subsection we assume that:
(A1) $n_-(T_{\min}) \le n_+(T_{\min})$
(A2) $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b$ and $\mathcal{H}_b (\subset \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b)$ are finite dimensional Hilbert spaces and Γ_b is a surjective linear mapping (3.11) satisfying (3.12).

For a function $y \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}$ we let

$$\Gamma_0' y = \{-y_1(a),\ i(\widehat{y}(a) - \widehat{\Gamma}_b y),\ \Gamma_{0b}y\} \in H \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b \tag{3.13}$$

$$\Gamma_1' y = \{y_0(a),\ \tfrac{1}{2}(\widehat{y}(a) + \widehat{\Gamma}_b y),\ -\Gamma_{1b}y\} \in H \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}_b, \tag{3.14}$$

where $y_0(a), \widehat{y}(a)$ and $y_1(a)$ are taken from the representation $y(t) = \{y_0(t),\ \widehat{y}(t),\ y_1(t)\} (\in H \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus H)$ of y.

Proposition 3.7. *A collection $\Pi_+ = \{\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ with*

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \underbrace{H \oplus \widehat{H}}_{H_0} \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b = H_0 \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b, \qquad \mathcal{H}_1 = \underbrace{H \oplus \widehat{H}}_{H_0} \oplus \mathcal{H}_b = H_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_b \tag{3.15}$$

$$\Gamma_0\{\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{f}\} = \Gamma_0' y, \qquad \Gamma_1\{\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{f}\} = \Gamma_1' y, \quad \{\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{f}\} \in T_{\max} \tag{3.16}$$

is a (so called decomposing) boundary triplet for $T_{\max}$. In (3.16) *$y \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{T}_{\max}$ is a function corresponding to $\{\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{f}\} \in T_{\max}$ in accordance with Remark 3.5.*

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{P}_0$, $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_1$ be the orthoprojectors in $\mathbb{H}$ onto the first, second and third component respectively in the decomposition $\mathbb{H} = H \oplus \widehat{H} \oplus H$ (see* (3.1)*). Then:*

(1) *For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ there exists a unique pair of operator solutions $v_0(\cdot, \lambda) \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta[H_0, \mathbb{H}]$ and $u(\cdot, \lambda) \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta[\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b, \mathbb{H}]$ of Eq.* (3.3) *satisfying*

$$\mathcal{P}_1 v_0(a,\lambda) = -P_{H_0,H}, \quad i(\widehat{\mathcal{P}} v_0(a,\lambda)h_0 - \widehat{\Gamma}_b(v_0(\cdot,\lambda)h_0)) = P_{H_0,\widehat{H}}, \quad \Gamma_{0b}(v_0(\cdot,\lambda)h_0) = 0$$
$$\mathcal{P}_1 u(a,\lambda) = 0, \quad i(\widehat{\mathcal{P}} u(a,\lambda)h_b - \widehat{\Gamma}_b(u(\cdot,\lambda)h_b)) = 0, \quad \Gamma_{0b}(u(\cdot,\lambda)h_b) = h_b$$

for all $h_0 \in H_0$ and $h_b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b$. Here $P_{H_0,H} \in [H_0, H]$ and $P_{H_0,\widehat{H}} \in [H_0, \widehat{H}]$ are the orthoprojectors in $H_0 (= H \oplus \widehat{H})$ onto H and $\widehat{H}$ respectively.

(2) *The Weyl function $M_+(\cdot)$ of the decomposing boundary triplet $\Pi_+ = \{\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ for $T_{\max}$ (see Definition 2.11) admits the representation*

$$M_+(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} m_0(\lambda) & M_{2+}(\lambda) \\ M_{3+}(\lambda) & M_{4+}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} : \underbrace{H_0 \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \to \underbrace{H_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_b}_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+ \tag{3.17}$$

$$m_0(\lambda) = (\mathcal{P}_0 + \widehat{\mathcal{P}})v_0(a,\lambda) + \tfrac{i}{2}P_{\widehat{H}}, \qquad M_{2+}(\lambda) = (\mathcal{P}_0 + \widehat{\mathcal{P}})u(a,\lambda) \tag{3.18}$$

$$M_{3+}(\lambda) = -\Gamma_{1b}v_0(\lambda), \qquad M_{4+}(\lambda) = -\Gamma_{1b}u(\lambda). \tag{3.19}$$

If in addition $n_+(T_{\min}) = n_-(T_{\min})$, then: (1) *the solutions $v_0(\cdot,\lambda)$ and $u(\cdot,\lambda)$ are defined for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$;* (2) *$\Pi_+$ turns into an ordinary boundary triplet $\Pi = \{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ for $T_{\max}$ with $\mathcal{H} = H_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_b$ and the Weyl function $M(\cdot)$ of the triplet Π is of the form*

$$M(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} m_0(\lambda) & M_2(\lambda) \\ M_3(\lambda) & M_4(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} : H_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_b \to H_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_b, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R} \tag{3.20}$$

$$m_0(\lambda) = (\mathcal{P}_0 + \widehat{\mathcal{P}})v_0(a,\lambda) + \tfrac{i}{2}P_{\widehat{H}}, \qquad M_2(\lambda) = (\mathcal{P}_0 + \widehat{\mathcal{P}})u(a,\lambda), \tag{3.21}$$

$$M_3(\lambda) = -\Gamma_{1b}v_0(\lambda), \qquad M_4(\lambda) = -\Gamma_{1b}u(\lambda). \tag{3.22}$$

Remark 3.9. According to [1, Proposition 4.5] the Weyl function $M_-(\cdot)$ of the decomposing boundary triplet Π_+ also admits the representation in terms of boundary values of respective operator solutions of Eq. (3.3) (cf. (3.17)–(3.19) for $M_+(\lambda)$).

4. Pseudospectral and spectral functions of symmetric systems

4.1. **q-pseudospectral functions.** In what follows we put $\mathfrak{H} := L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and denote by $\mathfrak{H}_b$ the set of all $\widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}$ with the following property: there exists $\beta_{\widetilde{f}} \in \mathcal{I}$ such that for some (and hence for all) function $f \in \widetilde{f}$ the equality $\Delta(t)f(t) = 0$ holds a.e. on $(\beta_{\widetilde{f}}, b)$.

Denote by $Y_0(\cdot,\lambda)$ the $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued operator solution of (3.3) satisfying $Y_0(a,\lambda) = I_{\mathbb{H}}$. With each $\widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b$ we associate the function $\widehat{f}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{H}$ given by

$$\widehat{f}(s) = \int_{\mathcal{I}} Y_0^*(t,s)\Delta(t)f(t)\,dt, \quad f(\cdot) \in \widetilde{f}. \tag{4.1}$$

By using the well known properties of the solution $Y_0(\cdot,\lambda)$ one can easily prove that $\widehat{f}(\cdot)$ is a continuous (and even holomorphic) function on $\mathbb{R}$.

Recall that an operator $V \in [\mathfrak{H}_1, \mathfrak{H}_2]$ is called a partial isometry if $||Vf|| = ||f||$ for all $f \in \mathfrak{H}_1 \ominus \ker V$.

Definition 4.1. A distribution function $\Sigma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathbb{H}]$ will be called a q-pseudospectral function of the system (3.2) if $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ for all $\widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b$ and the operator $V_b\widetilde{f} := \pi_\Sigma\widehat{f}$, $\widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b$, admits a continuation to a partial isometry $V = V_\Sigma \in [\mathfrak{H}, L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})]$.

The operator $V = V_\Sigma$ will be called the Fourier transform corresponding to $\Sigma(\cdot)$.

Clearly, if $\Sigma(\cdot)$ is a q-pseudospectral function, then for each $f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ there exists a unique $\widetilde{g}(= V_\Sigma\pi_\Delta f) \in L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ such that for each function $g(\cdot) \in \widetilde{g}$ one has

$$\lim_{\beta\uparrow b}\Big|\Big|g(\cdot) - \int\limits_{[a,\beta)} Y_0^*(t,\cdot)\Delta(t)f(t)\,dt\Big|\Big|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})} = 0.$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\Sigma(\cdot)$ be a q-pseudospectral function and let $V = V_\Sigma$ be the corresponding Fourier transform. Then for each $\widetilde{g} \in L^2_{loc}(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ the function*

$$f_{\widetilde{g}}(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_0(t,s)\, d\Sigma(s) g(s), \quad g(\cdot) \in \widetilde{g}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and $V^*\widetilde{g} = \pi_\Delta f_{\widetilde{g}}(\cdot)$. Therefore

$$V^*\widetilde{g} = \pi_\Delta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_0(\cdot,s)\, d\Sigma(s) g(s) \right), \quad \widetilde{g} \in L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H}), \;\; g(\cdot) \in \widetilde{g},$$

where the integral converges in the seminorm of $\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$.

Proof. According to Lemma 3.1 $f_{\widetilde{g}}(\cdot)$ is a continuous $\mathbb{H}$-valued function on $\mathcal{I}$ and by (2.6)

$$f_{\widetilde{g}}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_0(t,s)\Psi(s) g(s)\, d\sigma(s), \quad g(\cdot) \in \widetilde{g}, \tag{4.2}$$

where σ and Ψ are defined in Theorem 2.7, (1).

Let $f_*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ be a function such that $\pi_\Delta f_*(\cdot) = V^*\widetilde{g}$. Moreover, let $h \in \mathbb{H}$, let $\delta \subset \mathcal{I}$ be a compact interval and let $f(t) = \chi_\delta(t)h (\in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I}))$. We show that

$$\int_{\mathcal{I}} (f(t), \Delta(t) f_{\widetilde{g}}(t))_{\mathbb{H}}\, dt = \int_{\mathcal{I}} (f(t), \Delta(t) f_*(t))_{\mathbb{H}}\, dt. \tag{4.3}$$

In view of (4.2) one has

$$\int_{\mathcal{I}} (f(t), \Delta(t) f_{\widetilde{g}}(t))_{\mathbb{H}}\, dt = \int_{\mathcal{I}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\Delta(t) f(t), Y_0(t,s)\Psi(s) g(s))_{\mathbb{H}}\, d\sigma(s) \right) dt. \tag{4.4}$$

Since $Y_0(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a continuous function on $\mathcal{I} \times \mathbb{R}$, it follows that

$$\int\limits_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathbb{R}} |(\Delta(t) f(t), Y_0(t,s)\Psi(s) g(s))_{\mathbb{H}}|\; dt d\sigma(s) < \infty.$$

Therefore by the Fubini theorem one has

$$\begin{gathered}
\int_{\mathcal{I}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\Delta(t) f(t), Y_0(t,s)\Psi(s) g(s))_{\mathbb{H}}\, d\sigma(s) \right) dt = \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{I}} (\Delta(t) f(t), Y_0(t,s)\Psi(s) g(s))_{\mathbb{H}}\, dt \right) d\sigma(s) = \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{I}} (\Psi(s) Y_0^*(t,s)\Delta(t) f(t), g(s))_{\mathbb{H}}\, dt \right) d\sigma(s) = \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\Psi(s) \int_{\mathcal{I}} Y_0^*(t,s)\Delta(t) f(t)\, dt, g(s) \right)_{\mathbb{H}} d\sigma(s) = (V\pi_\Delta f, \widetilde{g})_{L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})} = \\
(\pi_\Delta f, V^*\widetilde{g})_{\mathfrak{H}} = \int_{\mathcal{I}} (f(t), \Delta(t) f_*(t)) dt.
\end{gathered}$$

Combining these relations with (4.4) one gets the equality (4.3).

It follows from (4.3) that $\Delta(t) f_{\widetilde{g}}(t) = \Delta(t) f_*(t)$ (a.e. on $\mathcal{I}$). Hence $f_{\widetilde{g}}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and $\pi_\Delta f_{\widetilde{g}}(\cdot) = \pi_\Delta f_*(\cdot) = V^*\widetilde{g}$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\Sigma(\cdot)$ be a q-pseudospectral function of the system (3.2) and let L_0 be a subspace in $L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ given by $L_0 = V_\Sigma \mathfrak{H}$. Then the multiplication operator Λ_Σ is L_0-minimal (in the sense of Definition 2.1).*

We omit the proof of Proposition 4.3, because it is similar to that of [1, Proposition 6.9].

Let V_Σ be the Fourier transform corresponding to the q-pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ and let $\mathfrak{H}_0 = \mathfrak{H} \ominus \ker V_\Sigma,\ L_0 = V_\Sigma \mathfrak{H} (= V_\Sigma \mathfrak{H}_0)$ and $L_0^\perp = L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H}) \ominus L_0$. Then

$$\mathfrak{H} = \ker V_\Sigma \oplus \mathfrak{H}_0, \qquad L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H}) = L_0 \oplus L_0^\perp. \tag{4.5}$$

Assume also that

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0 := \mathfrak{H}_0 \oplus L_0^\perp, \quad \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} := \overbrace{\ker V_\Sigma \oplus \mathfrak{H}_0}^{\mathfrak{H}} \oplus L_0^\perp = \mathfrak{H} \oplus L_0^\perp = \ker V_\Sigma \oplus \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0 \tag{4.6}$$

and let $\widetilde{V} = \widetilde{V}_\Sigma \in [\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0, L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})]$ be a unitary operator of the form

$$\widetilde{V} = (V_{0,\Sigma},\, I_{L_0^\perp}) : \mathfrak{H}_0 \oplus L_0^\perp \to L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H}), \tag{4.7}$$

where $V_{0,\Sigma} = V_\Sigma \restriction \mathfrak{H}_0$ and $I_{L_0^\perp}$ is an embedding operator from $L_0^\perp$ to $L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$. Since $\mathfrak{H} \subset \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$, one may consider $T_{\min}$ as a linear relation in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\Sigma(\cdot)$ be a q-pseudospectral function of the system (3.2) and let $\widetilde{V}$ be a unitary operator (4.7). Moreover, let $(T_{\min})^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}})$ be a linear relation adjoint to $T_{\min}$ in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ and let $\Lambda = \Lambda_\Sigma$ be the multiplication operator in $L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$. Then the equalities*

$$\widetilde{f} = \widetilde{V}^* \widetilde{g}, \qquad \widetilde{T}_0 \widetilde{f} = \widetilde{V}^* \Lambda \widetilde{g}, \quad \widetilde{g} \in \operatorname{dom} \Lambda \tag{4.8}$$

define a self-adjoint operator $\widetilde{T}_0$ in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0$ such that $\widetilde{T}_0 \subset (T_{\min})^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$.

Proof. It is easily seen that $(T_{\min})^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}} = T_{\max} \oplus (L_0^\perp)^2$. Moreover, in view of (4.7) and the equality $V^*_{0,\Sigma} \widetilde{g} = V^*_\Sigma \widetilde{g},\ \widetilde{g} \in L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$, one has

$$\widetilde{V}^* \widetilde{g} = V^*_\Sigma \widetilde{g} + P_{L_0^\perp} \widetilde{g}, \quad \widetilde{g} \in L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H}).$$

Therefore (4.8) can be written as

$$\widetilde{f} = V^*_\Sigma \widetilde{g} + P_{L_0^\perp} \widetilde{g}, \qquad \widetilde{T}_0 \widetilde{f} = V^*_\Sigma \Lambda \widetilde{g} + P_{L_0^\perp} \Lambda \widetilde{g}, \quad \widetilde{g} \in \operatorname{dom} \Lambda.$$

Thus to prove the inclusion $\widetilde{T}_0 \subset (T_{\min})^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$ it is sufficient to show that $\{V^*_\Sigma \widetilde{g}, V^*_\Sigma \Lambda \widetilde{g}\} \in T_{\max}$ for all $\widetilde{g} \in \operatorname{dom} \Lambda$.

Let $\widetilde{g} \in \operatorname{dom} \Lambda,\ g(\cdot) \in \widetilde{g}$ and let $E(\cdot) = E_\Sigma(\cdot)$ be the spectral measure of Λ. Then by (2.5) and (2.4) for each compact interval $\delta \subset \mathbb{R}$ one has $E(\delta)\widetilde{g} = \pi_\Sigma(\chi_\delta(\cdot) g(\cdot))$ and $\Lambda E(\delta)\widetilde{g} = \pi_\Sigma(s \chi_\delta(s) g(s))$. Therefore according to Proposition 4.2 $V^*_\Sigma E(\delta)\widetilde{g} = \pi_\Delta y(\cdot)$ and $V^*_\Sigma \Lambda E(\delta)\widetilde{g} = \pi_\Delta f(\cdot)$, where

$$y(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_0(t,s) d\Sigma(s) \chi_\delta(s) g(s), \quad f(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} s Y_0(t,s) d\Sigma(s) \chi_\delta(s) g(s).$$

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that $y \in AC(\mathcal{I};\mathbb{H})$ and

$$y'(t) = -J \int_{\mathbb{R}} (B(t) + s\Delta(t)) Y_0(t,s)\, d\Sigma(s) \chi_\delta(s) g(s) \quad (\text{a.e.on } \mathcal{I}).$$

Therefore

$$Jy'(t) - B(t)y(t) = \Delta(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}} s Y_0(t,s)\, d\Sigma(s) \chi_\delta(s) g(s) = \Delta(t) f(t) \quad (\text{a.e.on } \mathcal{I})$$

and, consequently, $\{y, f\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\max}$. Hence $\{V^*_\Sigma E(\delta)\widetilde{g}, V^*_\Sigma \Lambda E(\delta)\widetilde{g}\} (= \{\pi_\Delta y(\cdot), \pi_\Delta f(\cdot)\}) \in T_{\max}$ and passage to the limit when $\delta \to \mathbb{R}$ yields the required inclusion $\{V^*_\Sigma \widetilde{g}, V^*_\Sigma \Lambda \widetilde{g}\} \in T_{\max}$. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *For each q-pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ of the system* (3.2) *the corresponding Fourier transform V_Σ satisfies*

$$\operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \subset \ker V_\Sigma \tag{4.9}$$

(for $\operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$ *see Assertion 3.4, (1)).*

Proof. Let $\widetilde{T}_0 = \widetilde{T}_0^*$ be the operator in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0$ defined in Lemma 4.4 and let $(\widetilde{T}_0)^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$ be the linear relation adjoint to $\widetilde{T}_0$ in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$. Then $(\widetilde{T}_0)^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}} = \widetilde{T}_0 \oplus (\ker V_\Sigma)^2$ and the inclusion $\widetilde{T}_0 \subset (T_{\min})^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$ yields

$$T_{\min} \subset \widetilde{T}_0 \oplus (\ker V_\Sigma)^2. \tag{4.10}$$

Let $n \in \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$. Then $\{0, n\} \in T_{\min}$ and by (4.10) $\{0, n\} \in \widetilde{T}_0 \oplus (\ker V_\Sigma)^2$. Therefore there exist $f \in \operatorname{dom} \widetilde{T}_0$ and $g, g' \in \ker V_\Sigma$ such that

$$f + g = 0, \qquad \widetilde{T}_0 f + g' = n.$$

Since $f \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0,\ g \in \ker V_\Sigma$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0 \perp \ker V_\Sigma$ (see (4.6)), it follows that $f = g = 0$. Therefore $\widetilde{T}_0 f = 0$ and hence $n = g' \in \ker V_\Sigma$. This yields the inclusion (4.9). □

Remark 4.6. According to [21, Lemma 5] the equality

$$\Phi_s f = \int_{\mathcal{I}} Y_0^*(t,s)\Delta(t) f(t)\, dt, \quad \widetilde{f} \in \operatorname{dom} T_{\min} \cap \mathfrak{H}_b, \ \ s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{4.11}$$

defines a directing mapping Φ of $T_{\min}$ in the sense of [21]. By using this fact and Theorem 1 from [21] one can prove the inclusion (4.9) for q-pseudospectral functions $\Sigma(\cdot)$ satisfying the additional condition $||V_\Sigma \widetilde{f}|| = ||\widetilde{f}||,\ \widetilde{f} \in \operatorname{dom} T_{\min}$.

Definition 4.7. A q-pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ of the system (3.2) will be called a pseudospectral function if the corresponding Fourier transform V_Σ satisfies $\ker V_\Sigma = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$.

Definition 4.8. A distribution function $\Sigma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathbb{H}]$ will be called a spectral function of the system (3.2) if $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H})$ and the Parseval equality $||\widehat{f}||_{\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})} = ||\widetilde{f}||_{\mathfrak{H}}$ holds for all $\widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b$ (here $\widehat{f}$ is the Fourier transform (4.1)).

It follows from Proposition 4.5 that a pseudospectral function is a q-pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ with the minimally possible $\ker V_\Sigma$. Moreover, the same proposition yields the following assertion.

Assertion 4.9. *A distribution function $\Sigma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathbb{H}]$ is a spectral function of the system* (3.2) *if and only if it is a pseudospectral function with* $\ker V_\Sigma (= \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}) = \{0\}$ *(that is, with the isometry V_Σ).*

In the following we put $\mathfrak{H}_0 := \mathfrak{H} \ominus \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$, so that

$$\mathfrak{H} = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \oplus \mathfrak{H}_0. \tag{4.12}$$

Moreover, for a pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ we denote by $V_0 = V_{0,\Sigma}$ the isometry from $\mathfrak{H}_0$ to $L^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H})$ given by

$$V_{0,\Sigma} := V_\Sigma \restriction \mathfrak{H}_0. \tag{4.13}$$

Clearly, V_Σ admits the representation

$$V_\Sigma = (0,\, V_{0,\Sigma}) : \operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \oplus \mathfrak{H}_0 \to L^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H}) \tag{4.14}$$

4.2. **Pseudospectral functions and extensions of the minimal relation.** For a Hilbert space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} \supset \mathfrak{H}$ we put $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0 := \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} \ominus \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$, so that

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \oplus \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0. \tag{4.15}$$

It is clear that $\mathfrak{H}_0 \subset \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0$ (for $\mathfrak{H}_0$ see (4.12)).

Definition 4.10. A minimal exit space extension $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}})$ of $T_{\min}$ is referred to the class $\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ if $\operatorname{mul} \widetilde{T} = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$. Moreover, we denote by $\operatorname{Self}_0(T_{\min})$ the set of all canonical extensions $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}^*$ of $T_{\min}$ satisfying $\operatorname{mul} \widetilde{T} = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$.

Clearly, $\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min}) \subset \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})$ and $\operatorname{Self}_0(T_{\min}) \subset \operatorname{Self}(T_{\min})$. Moreover, if $\operatorname{mul} T_{\min} = \{0\}$, then $\widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ ($\operatorname{Self}_0(T_{\min})$) is the set of all extensions $\widetilde{T} \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})$ (resp. $\widetilde{T} \in \operatorname{Self}(T_{\min})$) which are the operators.

For each $\widetilde{T} \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ we will denote by $\widetilde{T}_0$ the operator part of $\widetilde{T}$, so that $\widetilde{T}_0$ is a self-adjoint operator in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0$. Let $E_0(\cdot)$ be the orthogonal spectral measure of $\widetilde{T}_0$ and let $F_0(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathfrak{H}_0]$ be a distribution function given by

$$F_0(t) = \widetilde{P}_{\mathfrak{H}_0} E_0((-\infty, t)) \restriction \mathfrak{H}_0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.16}$$

where $\widetilde{P}_{\mathfrak{H}_0}$ is the orthoprojector in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0$ onto $\mathfrak{H}_0$. It is clear that a spectral function $F(\cdot)$ of $T_{\min}$ generated by $\widetilde{T}$ is of the form

$$F(t) = \operatorname{diag}(F_0(t),\, 0) : \mathfrak{H}_0 \oplus \operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \to \mathfrak{H}_0 \oplus \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}. \tag{4.17}$$

Next assume that $\widetilde{T} \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ and that $F(\cdot)$ is a spectral function of $T_{\min}$ generated by $\widetilde{T}$. Moreover, let $\Sigma(\cdot)$ be a pseudospectral function of the system (3.2).

Definition 4.11. We write $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$ if

$$((F(\beta) - F(\alpha))\widetilde{f}, \widetilde{f})_{\mathfrak{H}} = \int_{[\alpha,\beta)} (d\Sigma(s)\widehat{f}(s), \widehat{f}(s)), \quad \widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b, \quad -\infty < \alpha < \beta < \infty. \tag{4.18}$$

Proposition 4.12. *For each pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ of the system (3.2) there exists a unique (up to the equivalence) exit space extension $\widetilde{T} \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ such that $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$. Moreover, there exists a unitary operator $\widetilde{V} \in [\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0, L^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H})]$ such that $\widetilde{V} \restriction \mathfrak{H}_0 = V_{0,\Sigma}$ and the operators $\widetilde{T}_0$ and Λ_Σ are unitarily equivalent by means of $\widetilde{V}$.*

Proof. For a given pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ we put $L_0 = V_\Sigma \mathfrak{H}_0$ and $L_0^\perp = L^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H}) \ominus L_0$, so that $L^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H}) = L_0 \oplus L_0^\perp$. Assume also that

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0 := \mathfrak{H}_0 \oplus L_0^\perp, \quad \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} := \operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \oplus \mathfrak{H}_0 \oplus L_0^\perp = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \oplus \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0 \tag{4.19}$$

and let $\widetilde{V} \in [\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0, L^2(\Sigma; \mathbb{H})]$ be a unitary operator (4.7). Since $\ker V_\Sigma = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$, it follows from Lemma 4.4 that the equalities (4.8) define a self-adjoint operator $\widetilde{T}_0$ in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0$. Moreover, in view of (4.8) the operators $\widetilde{T}_0$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda_\Sigma$ are unitarily equivalent by means of $\widetilde{V}$. Hence the spectral measure $E_0(\cdot)$ of $\widetilde{T}_0$ satisfies

$$E_0([\alpha, \beta)) = \widetilde{V}^* E_\Sigma([\alpha, \beta)) \widetilde{V}, \quad -\infty < \alpha < \beta < \infty. \tag{4.20}$$

Observe also that $\widetilde{V}\mathfrak{H}_0 = V_\Sigma \mathfrak{H}_0 = L_0$ and by Proposition 4.3 the operator Λ_Σ is L_0-minimal. Therefore the operator $\widetilde{T}_0$ is $\mathfrak{H}_0$-minimal.

It follows from the second equality in (4.19) that

$$\widetilde{T} := (\{0\} \oplus \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}) \oplus \widetilde{T}_0$$

is a self-adjoint linear relation in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ with the operator part $\widetilde{T}_0$ and $\operatorname{mul}\widetilde{T} = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$. Moreover, $\{0\}\oplus\operatorname{mul} T_{\min} \subset T_{\min} \subset (T_{\min})^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$ and by Lemma 4.4 $\widetilde{T}_0 \subset (T_{\min})^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$. Hence $\widetilde{T} \subset (T_{\min})^*_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$ and, consequently, $T_{\min} \subset \widetilde{T}$. Observe also that the relation $\widetilde{T}$ is $\mathfrak{H}$-minimal, since the operator $\widetilde{T}_0$ is $\mathfrak{H}_0$-minimal. Hence $\widetilde{T} \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$.

Next we show that $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$. Let $F(\cdot)$ be a spectral function of $T_{\min}$ generated by $\widetilde{T}$ and let $F_0(\cdot)$ be given by (4.16). By using (4.20) and (4.7) one can easily show that

$$F_0(\beta) - F_0(\alpha) = \widetilde{P}_{\mathfrak{H}_0} E_0([\alpha,\beta)) \upharpoonright \mathfrak{H}_0 = V_{0,\Sigma}^* E_\Sigma([\alpha,\beta)) V_{0,\Sigma}, \quad -\infty < \alpha < \beta < \infty.$$

Therefore by (4.17) and (4.14) one has

$$F(\beta) - F(\alpha) = V_\Sigma^* E_\Sigma([\alpha,\beta)) V_\Sigma, \quad -\infty < \alpha < \beta < \infty,$$

which is equivalent to (4.18). Hence $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$.

Finally, uniqueness of $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$ directly follows from (4.18) and $\mathfrak{H}$-minimality of $\widetilde{T}$. □

The following corollary is immediate from Proposition 4.12.

Corollary 4.13. *Let $\Sigma(\cdot)$ be a pseudospectral function of the system (3.2). Then $V_{0,\Sigma}$ is a unitary operator from $\mathfrak{H}_0$ onto $L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ if and only if $n_+(T_{\min}) = n_-(T_{\min})$ and $\widetilde{T}_\Sigma \in \operatorname{Self}_0(T_{\min})$. If these conditions are satisfied, then the operators $\widetilde{T}_0$ and Λ_Σ are unitarily equivalent by means of $V_{0,\Sigma}$.*

Remark 4.14. Applying [21, Theorem 1] to the directing mapping (4.11) one can give another proof of Proposition 4.12.

The following theorem is well known (see e.g. [3, 8, 35]).

Theorem 4.15. *Let $Y_0(\cdot,\lambda)$ be the $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued operator solution of Eq. (3.3) satisfying $Y_0(a,\lambda) = I_{\mathbb{H}}$. Then for each generalized resolvent $R(\lambda)$ of $T_{\min}$ there exists a unique operator function $\Omega(\cdot) : \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R} \to [\mathbb{H}]$ such that for each $\widetilde{f} \in L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$*

$$R(\lambda)\widetilde{f} = \pi_\Delta \left(\int_{\mathcal{I}} Y_0(\cdot,\lambda)(\Omega(\lambda) + \tfrac{1}{2}\operatorname{sgn}(t-x)J) Y_0^*(t,\overline{\lambda})\Delta(t) f(t)\, dt \right), \quad f \in \widetilde{f}. \tag{4.21}$$

Moreover, $\Omega(\cdot)$ is a Nevanlinna operator function.

Definition 4.16. [3, 35] The operator function $\Omega(\cdot)$ is called the characteristic matrix of the symmetric system (3.2) corresponding to the generalized resolvent $R(\lambda)$.

Since $\Omega(\cdot)$ is a Nevanlinna function, it follows that the equality (the Stieltjes formula)

$$\Sigma_\Omega(s) = \lim_{\delta\to+0} \lim_{\varepsilon\to+0} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\delta}^{s-\delta} \operatorname{Im}\Omega(\sigma+i\varepsilon)\, d\sigma. \tag{4.22}$$

defines a distribution $[\mathbb{H}]$-valued function $\Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$. This function is called a spectral function of $\Omega(\cdot)$.

Theorem 4.17. *Let $\widetilde{T} \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$, let $R(\cdot)$ be the generalized resolvent of $T_{\min}$ generated by $\widetilde{T}$, let $\Omega(\cdot)$ be the characteristic matrix corresponding to $R(\cdot)$ and let $\Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$ be the spectral function of $\Omega(\cdot)$. Then $\Sigma(\cdot) = \Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$ is a pseudospectral function of the system (3.2) and $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$ (in the sense of Definition 4.11). If in addition system (3.2) is absolutely definite, then $\Sigma(\cdot) = \Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$ is a unique pseudospectral function of this system satisfying $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$.*

Proof. (1) Assume that $\widetilde{T}$ is a linear relations in the Hilbert space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} \supset \mathfrak{H}$. Let $F(\cdot)$ be the spectral function of $T_{\min}$ induced by $\widetilde{T}$. By using (4.21) and the Stieltjes-Livšic inversion formula one proves the equality (4.18) for $\Sigma(\cdot) = \Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$ in the same way as Theorem 4 in [35].

Next assume that $\mathfrak{H}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ are decomposed as in (4.12) and (4.15) respectively. It follows from (4.18) and (2.3) that for any $\widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b$ one has $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ and $||\widehat{f}||_{\mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})} = ||P_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0}\widetilde{f}||_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}} \le ||\widetilde{f}||_{\mathfrak{H}}$. Hence the operator $V_b\widetilde{f} := \pi_\Sigma\widehat{f},\ \widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b$, admits a continuation to an operator $V \in [\mathfrak{H}, L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})]$ satisfying

$$||V\widetilde{f}||_{L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})} = ||P_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0}\widetilde{f}||_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}}, \quad \widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}. \tag{4.23}$$

It follows from (4.23), (4.15) and the inclusion $\mathfrak{H}_0 \subset \widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}_0$ that $V\widetilde{f} = 0,\ \widetilde{f} \in \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$, and $||V\widetilde{f}||_{L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})} = ||\widetilde{f}||_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}} = ||\widetilde{f}||_{\mathfrak{H}_0},\ \widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_0$. Thus V is a partial isometry with $\ker V = \operatorname{mul} T_{\min}$ and, consequently, $\Sigma(\cdot) = \Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$ is a pseudospectral function of the system (3.2). Moreover, $F(\cdot)$ satisfies (4.18), so that $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$.

(2) Now assume that system (3.2) is absolutely definite and show that in this case each pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ satisfying $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}_\Sigma$ coincides with $\Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$. So, let a pseudospectral function $\Sigma(\cdot)$ of the system (3.2) satisfies (4.18), let V_Σ be the corresponding Fourier transform and let E_Σ be spectral measure (2.5). Then by (4.18) for each finite interval $\delta = [\alpha, \beta) \subset \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$F(\beta) - F(\alpha) = V_\Sigma^* E_\Sigma(\delta) V_\Sigma \tag{4.24}$$

and Proposition 4.2 yields

$$(F(\beta) - F(\alpha))\widetilde{f} = \pi_\Delta\left(\int_\delta Y_0(\cdot, s)d\Sigma(s)\widehat{f}(s)\right), \quad \delta = [\alpha, \beta) \subset \mathbb{R},\ \ \widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b. \tag{4.25}$$

Substituting (4.1) into (4.25) and then using the Fubini theorem one can easily show that

$$(F(\beta) - F(\alpha))\widetilde{f} = \pi_\Delta\left(\int_{\mathcal{I}} K_{\delta,\Sigma}(\cdot, u)\Delta(u)f(u)\,du\right), \quad \delta = [\alpha, \beta) \subset \mathbb{R},\ \ \widetilde{f} \in \mathfrak{H}_b,\ \ f \in \widetilde{f}, \tag{4.26}$$

where

$$K_{\delta,\Sigma}(t, u) = \int_\delta Y_0(t, s)d\Sigma(s)Y_0^*(u, s), \quad t, u \in \mathcal{I}. \tag{4.27}$$

Let $K_{\delta,\Sigma_\Omega}(t, u)$ be given by (4.27) with $\Sigma(s) = \Sigma_\Omega(s)$ and let $K_\delta(t, u) = K_{\delta,\Sigma}(t, u) - K_{\delta,\Sigma_\Omega}(t, u),\ t, u \in \mathcal{I}$. It follows from Theorem 2.7 that there exist a scalar measure σ on $\mathcal{B}$ and functions $\Psi, \Psi_\Omega : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathbb{H}]$ such that

$$\Sigma(\beta) - \Sigma(\alpha) = \int_\delta \Psi(s)\,d\sigma(s) \ \text{ and } \ \Sigma_\Omega(\beta) - \Sigma_\Omega(\alpha) = \int_\delta \Psi_\Omega(s)\,d\sigma(s) \tag{4.28}$$

for any finite $\delta = [\alpha, \beta)$. Let $\widetilde{\Psi}(s) = \Psi(s) - \Psi_\Omega(s)$. Then in view of (4.27) one has

$$K_\delta(t, u) = \int_\delta Y_0(t, s)\widetilde{\Psi}(s)Y_0^*(u, s)\,d\sigma(s), \quad t, u \in \mathcal{I},\ \ \delta = [\alpha, \beta) \subset \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.29}$$

Since $\Sigma_\Omega(\cdot)$ also satisfies (4.18), the equality (4.26) holds with K_{δ,Σ_Ω} in place of $K_{\delta,\Sigma}$. Hence

$$\pi_\Delta\left(\int_{\mathcal{I}} K_\delta(\cdot, u)\Delta(u)f(u)\,du\right) = 0, \quad \delta = [\alpha, \beta) \subset \mathbb{R},\ \ f \in \mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I}),\ \ \pi_\Delta f \in \mathfrak{H}_b. \tag{4.30}$$

Denote by F (F') the set of all finite intervals $\delta=[\alpha,\beta)\subset\mathbb{R}$ (resp. $\delta'=[\alpha',\beta')\subset\mathcal{I}$) with rational endpoints. Moreover, let $\{e_j\}_1^n$ be a basis in $\mathbb{H}$. It follows from (4.30) that for any $\delta\in F,\ \delta'\in F'$ and e_j there exists a Borel set $B=B(\delta,\delta',e_j)\subset\mathcal{I}$ such that $\mu_1(\mathcal{I}\setminus B)=0$ and

$$\int_{\delta'}\Delta(t)K_\delta(t,u)\Delta(u)e_j\,du=0,\quad t\in B. \tag{4.31}$$

For each $\delta\in F$ put

$$\widetilde{K}_\delta(t,u)=\Delta(t)K_\delta(t,u)\Delta(u)=\int_\delta\Delta(t)Y_0(t,s)\widetilde{\Psi}(s)Y_0^*(u,s)\Delta(u)\,d\sigma(s) \tag{4.32}$$

and let $B_\delta=\{\{t,u\}\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}:\widetilde{K}_\delta(t,u)=0\},\ B_0=\bigcap\limits_{\delta\in F}B_\delta$. It follows from (4.31) that $\mu_2(\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}\setminus B_\delta)=0,\ \delta\in F$, and hence $\mu_2(\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}\setminus B_0)=0$ (here μ_2 is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}$). Let $X_\Delta=\{t\in\mathcal{I}:\Delta(t)\ \text{ is invertible}\}$. Since system (3.2) is absolutely definite, it follows that $\mu_1(X_\Delta)>0$. Hence $\mu_2(X_\Delta\times X_\Delta)>0$ and, consequently, $(X_\Delta\times X_\Delta)\cap B_0\neq\emptyset$. Therefore there exist t_0 and u_0 in I such that the operators $\Delta(t_0)$ and $\Delta(u_0)$ are invertible and the equality

$$\widetilde{K}_\delta(t_0,u_0)=\int_\delta\Delta(t_0)Y_0(t_0,s)\widetilde{\Psi}(s)Y_0^*(u_0,s)\Delta(u_0)\,d\sigma(s)=0$$

holds for all $\delta\in F$. Hence $\Delta(t_0)Y_0(t_0,s)\widetilde{\Psi}(s)Y_0^*(u_0,s)\Delta(u_0)=0$ (σ-a.e. on $\mathbb{R}$) and invertibility of $Y_0(t_0,s)$ and $Y_0^*(u_0,s)$ yields $\widetilde{\Psi}(s)=0$ (σ-a.e. on $\mathbb{R}$). Thus $\Psi(s)=\Psi_\Omega(s)$ and by (4.28) $\Sigma(s)=\Sigma_\omega(s)$. □

The above results show that in the case of the absolutely definite system (3.2) the equality $\widetilde{T}=\widetilde{T}_\Sigma$ gives a bijection between all pseudospectral functions $\Sigma(\cdot)$ and all exit space extensions $\widetilde{T}\in\widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$. The inverse bijection $\Sigma=\Sigma_{\widetilde{T}}$ is characterized by the following theorem, which is implied immediately by Proposition 4.12, Theorem 4.17 and Corollary 4.13.

Theorem 4.18. *Let system* (3.2) *be absolutely definite. Then the equalities* (4.21) *and* (4.22) *give a bijective correspondence* $\Sigma(\cdot)=\Sigma_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot)$ *between all extensions* $\widetilde{T}\in\widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ *and all pseudospectral functions* $\Sigma(\cdot)$. *More precisely, let* $\widetilde{T}\in\widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$, *let* $R(\cdot)=R_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot)$ *be the generalized resolvent of* $T_{\min}$ *induced by* $\widetilde{T}$, *let* $\Omega(\cdot)=\Omega_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot)$ *be the characteristic matrix corresponding to* $R_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot)$ *and let* $\Sigma_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot)$ *be the spectral function of* $\Omega_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot)$. *Then* $\Sigma_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot)$ *is a pseudospectral function of the system* (3.2). *Conversely, for each pseudospectral function* $\Sigma(\cdot)$ *of the system* (3.2) *there exists a unique (up to equivalence)* $\widetilde{T}\in\widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ *such that* $\Sigma(\cdot)=\Sigma_{\widetilde{T}}(\cdot)$.

Moreover, $V_{0,\Sigma}$ *is a unitary operator from* $\mathfrak{H}_0$ *onto* $L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})$ *if and only if* $n_+(T_{\min})=n_-(T_{\min})$ *and* $\Sigma(\cdot)=\Sigma_{\widetilde{T}}$ *with* $\widetilde{T}\in\mathrm{Self}_0(T_{\min})$.

Next, combining the results of this subsection with Assertion 4.9 one gets the following theorem.

Theorem 4.19. *The set of spectral functions of the system* (3.2) *is not empty if and only if* $\operatorname{mul}T_{\min}=\{0\}$. *If this condition is satisfied, then the set of spectral functions coincides with the set of pseudospectral functions and hence Proposition 4.12, Theorems 4.17, 4.18 and Corollary 4.13 hold with the following replacements: the phrase "spectral function(s)"*

instead of "pseudospectral function(s)"; the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$*, the operator* $\widetilde{T}$ *and the isometry* V_Σ *in place of* $\mathfrak{H}_0$*,* $\widetilde{T}_0$ *and* $V_{0,\Sigma}$ *respectively.*

Remark 4.20. For a not necessarily absolutely definite system Theorem 4.18 and the last statement of Theorem 4.17 could be easily obtained from Theorem 1 in [21] applied to the directing mapping (4.11). For this purpose it would be needed one of the statements of the mentioned Theorem 1, which is not proved in [21] (namely, uniqueness of a spectral function V of $\langle S;\Phi\rangle$ for a given extension $\widetilde{S}=\widetilde{S}^*$ of S, where the notations are taken from [21]). In fact, we do not know whether Theorem 4.18 and the last statement of Theorem 4.17 are valid for not absolutely definite systems (3.2).

5. Parametrization of pseudospectral and spectral functions

In the following we suppose that the assumptions (A1) and (A2) from Subsection 3.3 are satisfied.

Definition 5.1. Let $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ be finite dimensional Hilbert spaces (3.15). Then a boundary parameter τ is a collection $\tau=\{\tau_+,\tau_-\}\in\widetilde{R}_+(\mathcal{H}_0,\mathcal{H}_1)$ of the form (2.8).

In the case of equal deficiency indices $n_+(T_{\min})=n_-(T_{\min})$ one has

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b=\mathcal{H}_b,\qquad \mathcal{H}_0=\mathcal{H}_1=:\mathcal{H}=H_0\oplus\mathcal{H}_b \tag{5.1}$$

and a boundary parameter is an operator pair $\tau\in\widetilde{R}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by (2.9). If in addition $\tau\in\widetilde{R}^0(\mathcal{H})$, then a boundary parameter will be called self-adjoint. Such a boundary parameter τ admits the representation as a self-adjoint operator pair (2.10).

Let $\tau=\{\tau_+,\tau_-\}$ be a boundary parameter (2.8). For a given function $f\in\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ consider the boundary problem

$$Jy'-B(t)y=\lambda\Delta(t)y+\Delta(t)f(t),\quad t\in\mathcal{I} \tag{5.2}$$

$$C_0(\lambda)\Gamma'_0y-C_1(\lambda)\Gamma'_1y=0,\ \ \lambda\in\mathbb{C}_+;\qquad D_0(\lambda)\Gamma'_0y-D_1(\lambda)\Gamma'_1y=0,\ \ \lambda\in\mathbb{C}_-, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\Gamma'_0y\in\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\Gamma'_1y\in\mathcal{H}_1$ are defined by (3.13) and (3.14). A function $y(\cdot,\cdot):\mathcal{I}\times(\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R})\to\mathbb{H}$ is called a solution of this problem if for each $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$ the function $y(\cdot,\lambda)$ belongs to $AC(\mathcal{I};\mathbb{H})\cap\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ and satisfies the equation (5.2) a.e. on $\mathcal{I}$ (so that $y\in\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{T}_{\max}$) and the boundary conditions (5.3).

If $n_+(T_{\min})=n_-(T_{\min})$ and τ is a boundary parameter (2.9), then (5.3) takes the form

$$C_0(\lambda)\Gamma'_0y-C_1(\lambda)\Gamma'_1y=0,\quad \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}. \tag{5.4}$$

If in addition τ is a self-adjoint boundary parameter (2.10), then (5.4) turns into a self-adjoint boundary condition

$$C_0\Gamma'_0y-C_1\Gamma'_1y=0. \tag{5.5}$$

Observe also that in our paper [31] the boundary conditions (5.3)–(5.5) were represented in a more compact form.

Theorem 5.2. *Let* $\tau=\{\tau_+,\tau_-\}$ *be a boundary parameter* (2.8)*. Then for every* $f\in\mathcal{L}^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ *the boundary problem* (5.2), (5.3) *has a unique solution* $y(t,\lambda)=y_f(t,\lambda)$ *and the equality*

$$R(\lambda)\widetilde{f}=\pi_\Delta(y_f(\cdot,\lambda)),\quad \widetilde{f}\in L^2_\Delta(\mathcal{I}),\quad f\in\widetilde{f},\quad \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$$

defines a generalized resolvent $R(\lambda)=:R_\tau(\lambda)$ *of* $T_{\min}$*. Conversely, for each generalized resolvent* $R(\lambda)$ *of* $T_{\min}$ *there exists a unique boundary parameter* τ *such that* $R(\lambda)=R_\tau(\lambda)$*.*

If in addition $n_+(T_{\min}) = n_-(T_{\min})$*, then the above statements hold with the boundary parameter* τ *of the form* (2.9) *and the boundary condition* (5.4) *in place of* (5.3)*. Moreover,* $R_\tau(\lambda)$ *is a canonical resolvent of* $T_{\min}$ *if and only if* τ *is a self-adjoint boundary parameter* (2.10)*. In this case* $R_\tau(\lambda) = (\widetilde{T}^\tau - \lambda)^{-1}$*, where*

$$\widetilde{T}^\tau = \{\{\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{f}\} \in T_{\max} : C_0\Gamma'_0 y - C_1\Gamma'_1 y = 0\}. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. Let $\Pi_+ = \{\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ be the decomposing boundary triplet (3.15), (3.16) for $T_{\max}$. It follows from (3.16) and (3.13), (3.14) that the boundary problem (5.2), (5.3) is equivalent to (2.11)–(2.13). Now applying Theorem 2.12 we arrive at the required statements. □

According to Theorem 5.2 the boundary problem (5.2), (5.3) induces a bijective correspondence $R(\lambda) = R_\tau(\lambda)$ between boundary parameters τ and generalized resolvents $R(\lambda)$ of $T_{\min}$. In the following we denote by $\widetilde{T}^\tau (\in \widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}(T_{\min}))$ the extension of $T_{\min}$ generating $R_\tau(\cdot)$ and by $\Omega_\tau(\cdot)$ the characteristic matrix corresponding to $R_\tau(\cdot)$. Clearly, the equalities $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}^\tau$ and $\Omega(\cdot) = \Omega_\tau(\cdot) (= \Omega_{\widetilde{T}^\tau}(\cdot))$ gives a parametrization of all extensions $\widetilde{T} \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Self}}(T_{\min})$ and all characteristic matrices $\Omega(\cdot)$ of the system (3.2) respectively by means of a boundary parameter τ.

Let $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ be given by (3.15) and let $\mathcal{H}_2 := \mathcal{H}_0 \ominus \mathcal{H}_1 (= \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b \ominus \mathcal{H}_b)$, so that $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$. Denote by P_j the orthoprojector in $\mathcal{H}_0$ onto $\mathcal{H}_j$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Next, assume that $M_+(\cdot) : \mathbb{C}_+ \to [\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1]$ is the operator function (3.17)–(3.19) (this means that $M_+(\cdot)$ is the Weyl functions of the decomposing boundary triplet for $T_{\max}$) and let $\tau = \{\tau_+, \tau_-\}$ be a boundary parameter (2.8). It follows from Theorem 2.14 that there exist the limits $\mathcal{B}_\tau$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\tau$ of the form (2.18) and (2.19).

Definition 5.3. A boundary parameter τ will be called admissible if $\mathcal{B}_\tau = \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\tau = 0$.

The following assertions are immediate from the results of [30]:

(i) If $\lim\limits_{y\to\infty} \frac{1}{iy} M_+(iy) \restriction \mathcal{H}_1 = 0$, then τ is admissible if and only if $\mathcal{B}_\tau = 0$.

(ii) Every boundary parameter is admissible if and only if $\operatorname{mul} T_{\min} = \operatorname{mul} T_{\max}$ (see Assertion 3.4, (2)) or equivalently, if and only if $\lim\limits_{y\to\infty} \frac{1}{iy} M_+(iy) \restriction \mathcal{H}_1 = 0$ and

$$\lim_{y\to+\infty} y \left(\operatorname{Im}(M_+(iy)h_0, h_0)_{\mathcal{H}_0} + \tfrac{1}{2}||P_2 h_0||^2\right) = +\infty, \quad h_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0, \quad h_0 \neq 0. \tag{5.7}$$

In the following theorem we describe all pseudospectral functions of the system (3.2) in terms of the boundary parameter τ.

Theorem 5.4. *Let system* (3.2) *be absolutely definite and let* $n_-(T_{\min}) \le n_+(T_{\min})$*. Assume also that* $M_+(\cdot)$ *is the operator function* (3.17)–(3.19) *and let*

$$\Omega_0(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} m_0(\lambda) & -\frac{1}{2} I_{H,H_0} \\ -\frac{1}{2} P_{H_0,H} & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \underbrace{H_0 \oplus H}_{\mathbb{H}} \to \underbrace{H_0 \oplus H}_{\mathbb{H}}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \tag{5.8}$$

$$S_1(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} m_0(\lambda) - \frac{i}{2} P_{\widehat{H}} & M_{2+}(\lambda) \\ -P_{H_0,H} & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \underbrace{H_0 \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \to \underbrace{H_0 \oplus H}_{\mathbb{H}}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$$

$$S_2(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} m_0(\lambda) + \frac{i}{2} P_{\widehat{H}} & -I_{H,H_0} \\ M_{3+}(\lambda) & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \underbrace{H_0 \oplus H}_{\mathbb{H}} \to \underbrace{H_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_b}_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

where $P_{H_0,H} \in [H_0, H]$ is the orthoprojector in H_0 onto H, $I_{H,H_0} \in [H, H_0]$ is the embedding operator of H into H_0 and $P_{\widehat{H}} \in [H_0]$ is the orthoprojector in H_0 onto $\widehat{H}$ (see (3.1)*). Then the equalities*

$$\Omega_\tau(\lambda) = \Omega_0(\lambda) + S_1(\lambda)(C_0(\lambda) - C_1(\lambda)M_+(\lambda))^{-1}C_1(\lambda)S_2(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+ \tag{5.9}$$

$$\Sigma(s) = \Sigma_\tau(s) = \lim_{\delta\to+0}\lim_{\varepsilon\to+0}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-\delta}^{s-\delta}\operatorname{Im}\Omega_\tau(\sigma+i\varepsilon)\,d\sigma. \tag{5.10}$$

establish a bijective correspondence between all admissible boundary parameters $\tau = \{\tau_+, \tau_-\}$ defined by (2.8) *and all pseudospectral functions $\Sigma(\cdot) = \Sigma_\tau(\cdot)$ of the system* (3.2)*.*

Proof. As it was mentioned in the proof of Theorem 5.2, the problem (5.2), (5.3) can be represented in terms of the decomposing boundary triplet Π_+ for $T_{\max}$ as (2.11)-(2.13). Hence the parametrization of generalized resolvents $R(\lambda) = R_\tau(\lambda)$ and the corresponding extensions $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}^\tau \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}(T_{\min})$ coincides with the parametrization of the same objects in terms of the triplet Π_+ given in Theorem 2.12. Therefore according to Theorem 2.14 $\widetilde{T}^\tau \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Self}}_0(T_{\min})$ if and only if τ is admissible. Moreover, the parametrization of all characteristic matrices $\Omega_\tau(\cdot) = \Omega_{\widetilde{T}^\tau}(\cdot)$ in the form (5.9) was obtained in [31, Theorem 4.6]. Combining these facts with Theorem 4.18 we arrive at the required statement. □

Assume now that $T_{\min}$ has equal deficiency indices $n_+(T_{\min}) = n_-(T_{\min})$. Then (5.1) holds and the equalities (3.20)–(3.22) define a (Nevanlinna) operator function $M(\cdot)$ (the Weyl function of the ordinary decomposing boundary triplet $\Pi = \{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ for $T_{\max}$). Observe also that in this case:

(1) a boundary parameter $\tau \in \widetilde{R}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined by (2.9) and the equalities (2.18) and (2.19) take a simpler form (2.21) and (2.22).

(2) the condition (5.7) turns into

$$\lim_{y\to\infty} y\cdot\operatorname{Im}(M(iy)h,h) = +\infty, \quad h\in\mathcal{H}, \quad h\neq 0.$$

Theorem 5.5. *Let system* (3.2) *be absolutely definite and let $n_+(T_{\min}) = n_-(T_{\min})$. Moreover, let $M(\cdot)$ be given by* (3.20)–(3.22)*, let $\Omega_0(\cdot)$ be defined by* (5.8) *and let*

$$S(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} m_0(\lambda) - \frac{i}{2}P_{\widehat{H}} & M_2(\lambda) \\ -P_{H_0,H} & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \underbrace{H_0\oplus\mathcal{H}_b}_{\mathcal{H}} \to \underbrace{H_0\oplus H}_{\mathbb{H}}, \quad \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}.$$

Then the equality

$$\Omega_\tau(\lambda) = \Omega_0(\lambda) + S(\lambda)(C_0(\lambda) - C_1(\lambda)M(\lambda))^{-1}C_1(\lambda)S^*(\overline{\lambda}), \quad \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R} \tag{5.11}$$

together with the Stieljes formula (5.10) *establishes a bijective correspondence between all admissible boundary parameters τ of the form* (2.9) *and all pseudospectral functions $\Sigma(\cdot) = \Sigma_\tau(\cdot)$ of the system.*

Moreover, $V_{0,\Sigma}(\in [\mathfrak{H}_0, L^2(\Sigma;\mathbb{H})])$ is a unitary operator if and only if τ is a self-adjoint (admissible) boundary parameter. If this condition is satisfied, then equality (5.6) *defines an extension $\widetilde{T}^\tau \in \operatorname{Self}_0(T_{\min})$ and the operators $\widetilde{T}_0^\tau$ (the operator part of $\widetilde{T}^\tau$) and Λ_Σ are unitarily equivalent by means of $V_{0,\Sigma}$.*

Proof. According to [31, Theorem 4.9] in the case $n_+(T_{\min}) = n_-(T_{\min})$ equality (5.9) admits the representation (5.11). This and Theorem 5.4 yield the first statement. Moreover, combining the last statements of Theorems 4.18 and 5.2 one obtains other statements of the theorem. □

The following corollary is immediate from Theorem 4.19.

Corollary 5.6. *If* $\operatorname{mul} T_{\min} = \{0\}$*, then Theorems 5.4 and 5.5 are valid for spectral functions* $\Sigma(\cdot)$ *(instead of pseudospectral ones). Moreover, in this case equality* (5.6) *defines the operator* $\widetilde{T}^\tau$ *and the last statements of Theorem 5.5 hold with* V_Σ *and* $\widetilde{T}^\tau$ *in place of* $V_{0,\Sigma}$ *and* $\widetilde{T}_0^\tau$ *respectively.*

References

[1] S. Albeverio, M.M. Malamud, V.I.Mogilevskii,*On Titchmarsh-Weyl functions and eigenfunction expansions of first-order symmetric systems*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory **77** (2013), 303–354.

[2] F.V. Atkinson, *Discrete and continuous boundary problems*, Academic Press, New York, 1963.

[3] V.M. Bruk, *Linear relations in a space of vector functions*, Math. Notes **24** (1978), no 4, 767–773.

[4] V.A. Derkach, S. Hassi, M.M. Malamud, H.S.V. de Snoo, *Generalized resolvents of symmetric operators and admissibility*, Methods of Functional Analysis and Topology **6** (2000), no 3 , 24–55.

[5] V.A. Derkach, S. Hassi, M.M. Malamud, and H.S.V. de Snoo, *Boundary relations and generalized resolvents of symmetric operators*, Russian J. Math. Ph. **16** (2009), no. 1, 17–60.

[6] V.A. Derkach, M.M. Malamud, *Generalized resolvents and the boundary value problems for Hermitian operators with gaps*, J. Funct. Anal. **95** (1991), 1–95.

[7] A. Dijksma, H. Langer, H.S.V. de Snoo, *Hamiltonian systems with eigenvalue depending boundary conditions*, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. **35** (1988), 37–83.

[8] A. Dijksma, H. Langer, H.S.V. de Snoo, *Eigenvalues and pole functions of Hamiltonian systems with eigenvalue depending boundary conditions*, Math. Nachr. **161** (1993), 107–153.

[9] N. Dunford and J.T. Schwartz, *Linear operators. Part2. Spectral theory*, Interscience Publishers, New York-London, 1963.

[10] Ch. T. Fulton, *Parametrizations of Titchmarsh's* $m(\lambda)$*-functions in the limit circle case*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **229** (1977), 51–63.

[11] I. Gohberg, M.G. Krein, *Theory and applications of Volterra operators in Hilbert space*, Transl. Math. Monographs, 24, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1970

[12] M.L. Gorbachuk, *On spectral functios of a differential equation of the second order with operator-valued coefficients*, Ukrain. Mat. Zh. **18** (1966), no 2 , 3–21.

[13] V.I. Gorbachuk, M.L. Gorbachuk, *Boundary problems for differential-operator equations*, Kluver Acad. Publ., Dordrecht-Boston-London, 1991. (Russian edition: Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1984).

[14] D.B. Hinton, J.K. Shaw, *Parameterization of the* $M(\lambda)$ *function for a Hamiltonian system of limit circle type*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **93** (1982/83), no 3-4, 349-360.

[15] A.M. Khol'kin, *Description of selfadjoint extensions of differential operators of an arbitrary order on the infinite interval in the absolutely indefinite case*, Teor. Funkcii Funkcional. Anal. Prilozhen. **44** (1985), 112–122.

[16] I.S. Kats, *On Hilbert spaces generated by monotone Hermitian matrix-functions*, Khar'kov. Gos. Univ. Uchen. Zap. **34** (1950), 95-113. Zap.Mat.Otdel.Fiz.-Mat. Fak. i Khar'kov. Mat. Obshch. (4)**22** (1950), 95–113.

[17] I.S. Kats, *Linear relations generated by canonical differential equations*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **17**(1983), no. 4, 315–317.

[18] I.S. Kats, *Linear relations generated by the canonical differential equation of phase dimension 2, and eigenfunction expansion*, St. Petersburg Math. J. **14**, 429–452 (2003).

[19] I.S. Kac, M.G. Krein, *On spectral functions of a string*, Supplement to the Russian edition of F.V. Atkinson , *Discrete and continuous boundary problems*, Mir, Moscow, 1968.

[20] H. Langer and B. Textorius, *A generalization of M. G. Krein's method of directing functional to linear relations*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **81** (1978), 237-246.

[21] H. Langer and B. Textorius, *Spectral functions of a symmetric linear relation with a directing mapping, I*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **97** (1984), 165-176.

[22] H. Langer and B. Textorius, *Spectral functions of a symmetric linear relation with a directing mapping, II*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **101** (1985), 111-124.

[23] M. Lesch, M.M. Malamud, *On the deficiency indices and self-adjointness of symmetric Hamiltonian systems*, J. Differential Equations **189** (2003), 556–615.

[24] M. M. Malamud, *On the formula of generalized resolvents of a nondensely defined Hermitian operator*, Ukr. Math. Zh. **44**(1992), no 12, 1658-1688.
[25] V.I.Mogilevskii, *Nevanlinna type families of linear relations and the dilation theorem*, Methods Funct. Anal. Topology **12** (2006), no 1, 38–56.
[26] V.I.Mogilevskii, *Boundary triplets and Krein type resolvent formula for symmetric operators with unequal defect numbers*, Methods Funct. Anal. Topology **12** (2006), no 3, 258–280.
[27] V.I.Mogilevskii, *Description of spectral functions of differential operators with arbitrary deficiency indices*, Math. Notes **81** (2007), no 4, 553–559.
[28] V.I.Mogilevskii, *Description of generalized resolvents and characteristic matrices of differential operators in terms of the boundary parameter*, Math. Notes **90** (2011), no 4, 548–570.
[29] V.I.Mogilevskii, *On eigenfunction expansions of first-order symmetric systems and ordinary differential operators of an odd order*, arXive:1307.6741[math.FA] 25 Jul 2013.
[30] V.I.Mogilevskii, *On exit space extensions of symmetric operators with applications to first order symmetric systems*, Methods Funct. Anal. Topology **19** (2013), no 3, 268–292.
[31] V.I.Mogilevskii, *On generalized resolvents and characteristic matrices of first-order symmetric systems*, arXiv:1403.3995v1 [math.FA] 16 Mar 2014.
[32] B.C. Orcutt, *Canonical differential equations*, Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1969.
[33] A.L. Sakhnovich, *Spectral functions of a canonical system of order* $2n$, Mat. Sb. **181** (1990), no. 11, 1510–1524 (Russian); English transl. : Math. USSR-Sb. **71** (1992), no. 2, 355–369.
[34] A.L. Sakhnovich, L.A. Sakhnovich, and I.Ya. Roitberg, *Inverse problems and nonlinear evolution equations. Solutions, Darboux matrices and Weyl-Titchmarsh functions*, De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics 47. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2013.
[35] A.V. Štraus, *On generalized resolvents and spectral functions of differential operators of an even order*, Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, Ser.Mat., **21**, (1957), 785–808.

Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, NAS of Ukraine, R. Luxemburg Str. 74, 83050 Donetsk, Ukraine

Department of Mathematics, Lugans'k National University, Oboronna Str. 2, 91011 Lugans'k, Ukraine

E-mail address: vim@mail.dsip.net